

agreed to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2326) to amend the Act of August 3, 1950, as amended, to continue in effect the provisions thereof relating to the authorized personnel strengths of the Armed Forces.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled bill (H. R. 7996) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1954, and for other purposes, and it was signed by the Acting President pro tempore.

SUBVERSIVES CROSSING THE MEXICAN BORDER

Mr. DANIEL. Mr. President, on yesterday the Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN] made the charge that approximately 100 subversives were daily crossing the Mexican border into the United States; and in support of this he cited a statement given before a subcommittee of the House Appropriations Committee, which did appear to say that at one time 100 members or former members of the Communist Party had daily crossed the border at El Paso, Tex.

Mr. President, I have been informed by the Commissioner of Immigration that the Senator from New York has not correctly interpreted the statement, and that no subversives are now crossing the Mexican border into the United States, within their knowledge. The Commissioner is preparing a statement which will clear up any incorrect impression left by the testimony cited yesterday by the Senator from New York.

On Monday, I shall present to the Senate the letter and statement from the Commissioner of Immigration; but, Mr. President, I am glad to say at this time that I have been assured that it will be clear that the statement made yesterday by the Senator from New York—namely, that 100 subversives are now coming, each day, into this country, from Mexico—is incorrect.

RECESS TO MONDAY

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, pursuant to the order previously entered, I move that the Senate take a recess until Monday next at 12 o'clock noon.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 14 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess, the recess being, under the order previously entered, until Monday, March 8, 1954, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate March 4 (legislative day of March 1), 1954:

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

J. Ernest Wilkins, of Illinois, to be Assistant Secretary of Labor, vice Spencer Miller, Jr.

UNITED STATES MARSHAL

Ray H. Schoonover, of Wisconsin, to be United States marshal for the western district of Wisconsin, vice John M. Comeford, resigned.

UNITED STATES COAST AND GEODETIC SURVEY

Robert F. A. Studds to be Director of the Coast and Geodetic Survey for a term of 4 years, effective May 12, 1954.

Subject to qualifications provided by law, the following for permanent appointment to the grade indicated in the Coast and Geodetic Survey:

To be commissioned captain

Walter H. Bainbridge
Carl I. Aslakson
Paul A. Smith

IN THE MARINE CORPS

The following-named officer of the Marine Corps Reserve for permanent appointment to the grade of major general subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

Karl S. Day

The following-named officers of the Marine Corps Reserve for permanent appointment to the grade of brigadier general subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

John D. Macklin
Bertrand T. Fay

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, MARCH 4, 1954

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Thou who art the beneficent and supreme ruler of the universe and the guiding intelligence in the life of men and nations, we rejoice that here in our beloved country Thou hast ordained and established sovereignty by the free will of the people.

Grant that our citizens may always have a lofty conception of the Presidency, rendering unto him who occupies this exalted position that respect, reverence, honor, and encouragement to which his sacred office entitles him.

May all the Members of the Congress, who are joined with the President in the exercise of government, rule in the fear of God and be given that favor and influence with the people they represent, which come from doing justly, loving mercy, and walking humbly with the Lord.

Wilt Thou hear and answer our petitions as we daily pray for our fellow Members who are absent from this Chamber by reason of illness and who need Thy healing ministry.

In Christ's name we pray. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Carrell, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a joint resolution of the House of the following title:

H. J. Res. 355. Joint resolution amending the act approved July 12, 1951 (65 Stat. 119, 7 U. S. C. 1461-1468), as amended, relating to the supplying of agricultural workers from the Republic of Mexico.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed a bill of the following

title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 2714. An act to increase the borrowing power of Commodity Credit Corporation.

SUBCOMMITTEE OF COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Rivers and Harbors of the Public Works Committee may meet this afternoon during general debate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oregon?

There was no objection.

THE UNEMPLOYMENT SITUATION IS BECOMING SERIOUS

Mr. HELLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. HELLER. Mr. Speaker, if anyone still entertains any doubts that we are in the throes of a serious economic situation, I invite him to visit my congressional district. As I go through the district, as I talk to the people, as I observe the increasing rolls of the unemployed, I cannot help but feel uneasy about the future.

Former President Herbert Hoover, who considers himself an expert on economic depressions, recently assured the Nation it can have high confidence that it is not headed into another great depression such as the one of the early 1930's. He referred to the present situation as only a passing dip. When such assurances come from the man whose very name is associated with the "Hoover depression," and whose words still have that familiar ring of prosperity is just around the corner, then it is high time for us to consider this situation a little more seriously.

Mr. Speaker, about a month ago—on February 4, 1954—I called to the attention of this House the unemployment situation in my congressional district. I cited facts and figures about layoffs in the Brooklyn Navy Yard in my district. I told of the closing down of the Naval Clothing Factory and the transfer of the Naval Supply Facilities from Brooklyn to a depot elsewhere. I stressed how the unemployment situation resulting therefrom is having a serious economic strain on the economy of our community. In my appeal for "prompt and forceful action" by the administration, I said:

While the administration is still sitting back taking no measures to deal with this snowballing unemployment situation, the problem is assuming serious dimensions in our local communities. In my district, the effects of the situation are becoming more noticeable with each passing day. Not only is the growing unemployment affecting the workers and their families directly involved, but also those who live in constant fear of an approaching layoff, and it is also having a telling effect on the storekeeper, the small-business man, and the manufacturer whose

volume of business is shrinking. In short, the whole community suffers because of this most infectious disease.

Mr. Speaker, I ask again: What is the administration doing about these people? Does it have any plans to cope with the situation? What steps is it taking to prevent a breakdown of our economic foundations? I am still waiting for a reply to these questions.

Mr. Speaker, it seems that those of us who call attention to this situation and warn of the coming dangers are derided and scorned. "They are trying to talk the country into a depression," charged one administration spokesman. "Folks who are out of jobs these days and who think business is not good are just a bunch of eggheads," said another. This is the way the administration is fighting the current economic recession.

But while they talk of eggheads and dips and seasonal readjustment, unemployment keeps growing and the number of claimants for unemployment compensation increases every week. According to information just released by the United States Department of Labor, more persons claimed unemployment compensation benefit in mid-February of this year than at any time since February 1950. By the middle of February 1954 unemployment insurance claims totaled 2,179,000, or about double the figure of a year ago at this time. The total of such claims for the week ending February 13 was greater by 58,500 over the preceding week, according to the Labor Department.

I am citing these official figures on unemployment compensation because these figures cannot be questioned. Unfortunately, where it concerns statistics dealing with unemployment there are many who question the veracity of these figures given out periodically by the Government. It is claimed that the unemployment statistics are either inaccurate or are several months behind. Senator WAYNE MORSE, of Oregon, recently observed on the Senate floor:

There is no question about the fact that unemployment has increased to a serious degree. In fact, if we had accurate figures, which I am satisfied we do not have—because the administration cannot even agree on the base which it should use for measuring unemployment—I think they would show the number of unemployed persons in the United States today to be nearer 4 million than 3 million.

Mr. Speaker, we cannot sit back and simply wait, as has been suggested, for an upturn in the spring or summer. What if the upturn never materializes? What if the situation gets out of hand by then? This course is as dangerous as it is unrealistic.

We cannot turn our heads away from the facts and hope that somehow the annoying unemployment problem will miraculously disappear, when headlines across the Nation continue to paint a grim picture of mounting joblessness in New York, Massachusetts, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Indiana, Ohio, Illinois, Michigan, Wisconsin, Oregon, Washington, California, and other States. It indicates a clear and steady drift toward economic depression.

Now is the time to come forward with an effective Government program to deal with this problem before the drift swells into a deluge and inundates the entire Nation. Such program should include steps to strengthen the unemployment-insurance system, broaden the social-security system, increase the minimum wage, extend tax reduction to the low-income people and the great mass of consumers instead of big business, undertake a huge housing program designed for low- and middle-income families, as well as a large-scale program of public works, new schools, good roads, and similar projects from which the people would benefit.

Mr. Speaker, this is the kind of a program that was initiated by men of vision and faith two decades ago under the inspiring leadership of Franklin D. Roosevelt. It helped then, it will help now. Let us learn from past experience.

PRIVATE CALENDAR

The SPEAKER. This is the day fixed for the call of the Private Calendar. The Clerk will call the first bill on the calendar.

ALBERT VINCENT, SR.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 6033) for the relief of Albert Vincent, Sr.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Albert Vincent, Sr., route 1, box 337, St. Martinville, La., the sum of \$336, in full settlement of all claims of said Albert Vincent, Sr., against the United States for regular subsistence pay for the period September 26, 1949, through January 17, 1950, in the adult academic education program through the Iberia Parish School Board in Louisiana: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

WILHELM ENGELBERT

The Clerk called the bill (S. 153) for the relief of Wilhelm Engelbert.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Wilhelm Engelbert shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act upon payment of the required visa fee.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FELIX S. SCHORR AND WIFE

The Clerk called the bill (S. 303) for the relief of Felix S. Schorr and his wife, Lilly Elizabeth Schorr.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Felix S. Schorr and his wife, Lilly Elizabeth Schorr, shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fees. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such aliens as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct the required numbers from the appropriate quota or quotas for the first year that such quota or quotas are available.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PETER PENOVIC ET AL.

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1432) for the relief of Peter Penovic, Milos Grachovac, and Nikola Maljkovic.

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill may be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

MICHELE PACCIONE

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 666) for the relief of Michele Paccione.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of sections 101 (a) (27) (A) and 205 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, the minor child, Michele Paccione, shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien child of Mr. and Mrs. Dominic J. Savino, citizens of the United States.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

KIM MI HAE

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 858) for the relief of Kim Mi Hae.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the provisions of the immigration laws relating to the exclusion of aliens inadmissible because of race shall not hereafter apply to Kim Mi Hae, the Korean fiancé of Walter C. Brown, a citizen of the United States and a veteran of World War II presently serving in the United States Air Force, and that the said Kim Mi Hae shall be eligible for a visa as a nonimmigrant temporary visitor for a period of 3 months: *Provided*, That the administrative authorities find that the said Kim Mi Hae is coming to the United States with a bona fide intention of being married to the said Walter C. Brown, and that she is found otherwise admissible under the immigration laws. In the event the marriage between the above-named parties does not occur within 3 months after the entry of the said Kim Mi Hae, she shall be required to depart from the United States, and upon failure to do so shall be

deported in accordance with the provisions of sections 19 and 20 of the Immigration Act of 1917, as amended (U. S. C. title 8, secs. 155 and 156). In the event that the marriage between the above-named parties shall occur within 3 months after the entry of the said Kim Mi Hae, the Attorney General is authorized and directed to record the lawful admission for permanent residence of the said Kim Mi Hae as of the date of the payment by her of the required visa fee and head tax:

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following: "That, in the administration of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Kim Mi Hae, the fiancée of Walter C. Brown, a citizen of the United States, shall be eligible for a visa as a nonimmigrant temporary visitor for a period of 3 months: *Provided*, That the administrative authorities find that the said Kim Mi Hae is coming to the United States with a bona fide intention of being married to the said Walter C. Brown and that she is found otherwise admissible under the immigration laws. In the event the marriage between the above-named persons does not occur within 3 months after the entry of the said Kim Mi Hae, she shall be required to depart from the United States and upon failure to do so shall be deported in accordance with the provisions of sections 242 and 243 of the Immigration and Nationality Act. In the event that the marriage between the above-named persons shall occur within 3 months after the entry of the said Kim Mi Hae, the Attorney General is authorized and directed to record the lawful admission for permanent residence of the said Kim Mi Hae as of the date of the payment by her of the required visa fee."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PETER A. PIROGOV

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1100) for the relief of Peter A. Pirogov.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Peter A. Pirogov shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act upon payment of the required visa fee. In the administration of that act, the said Peter A. Pirogov shall not be regarded as having been at any time prior to the enactment of this act a person within the provisions of section 212 (a) (28) (c) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (66 Stat. 163).

SEC. 2. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

With the following committee amendments:

On line 6, strike out the words "the date of the enactment of this act" and substitute in lieu thereof "February 4, 1949."

On line 10, strike out "(c)" and substitute in lieu thereof "(C)."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third

time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I am sincerely pleased that the House has seen fit to grant its unanimous consent to the passage of H. R. 1100, a private bill which I introduced, at the request of a representative of one of the executive agencies of our Government, for the relief of Peter A. Pirogov.

Mr. Speaker, you will recall the newspaper headlines of October 20, 1948, which informed us that 2 Soviet officers had fled to American controlled Austria, landing their twin-engine Soviet bomber at a United States Army base near Linz, Austria, on October 9, 1948. This was the first instance where Soviet airmen had had the courage to flee the oppression of their native land to seek freedom elsewhere. The two airmen credited the Voice of America broadcasts as the final inspiration in their determination to escape Russian despotism.

Mr. Pirogov stated at a press interview held at the time of his escape that his personal ideas and ideology were not in agreement with the Communist ideology. He said:

I feel that the Government should answer the needs and desires of the people. * * * I feel that the Soviet Union does not meet the needs and desires of the people.

Mr. Pirogov told the press that he was desirous of obtaining asylum in this country because he believed in freedom of speech, freedom of the press, freedom to work and to live.

Mr. Speaker, Mr. Pirogov has been in this country since February 4, 1949. Since that time, he has given valuable assistance to various agencies of our Government. Since his arrival here he has met and married a very charming young lady, who like himself is a Russian refugee. Approximately a year and a half ago she presented him with twin daughters, born in our land of freedom.

Mr. Speaker, Mr. Pirogov's statements to the press upon his escape speak for themselves. His conduct since coming to this country has been exemplary. This augurs well for the future. I am confident that he will continue to be an asset to our way of life.

Mr. Speaker, I am sure that the membership of the House joins with me in extending to Mr. Pirogov and his family a continued happy and successful life in these United States.

PRAMOVIL VACLAV MALY AND JARMILA MALY

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3145) for the relief of Pramovil Vaclav Maly and Jarmila Maly.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the immigration and naturalization laws, the aliens Pramovil Vaclav Maly and Jar-

mila Maly shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fees and head taxes. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such aliens as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct two numbers from the number of displaced persons who shall be granted the status of permanent residence pursuant to section 4 of the Displaced Persons Act, as amended (62 Stat. 1011, 64 Stat. 219; 50 U. S. C. App., sec. 1953).

With the following committee amendments:

On page 1, line 8, strike out the words "and head taxes."

On page 1, line 4, strike out "Pramovil" and substitute the name "Pravomil."

On pages 1 and 2, beginning on page 1, line 11, after the words "to deduct two numbers", strike out the remainder of the bill and insert in lieu thereof the following: "from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill for the relief of Pravomil Vaclav Maly and Jarmila Maly."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PETRA FUMIA

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3836) for the relief of Petra Fumia.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of sections 101 (a) (27) (A) and 205 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, the minor child, Petra Fumia, shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien child of Mr. and Mrs. Angelo Ruta, citizens of the United States.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MRS. MADELEINE ALICE AQUARONE

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 7559) for the relief of Mrs. Madeleine Alice Aquarone.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, in the administration of the immigration and nationality laws, section 352 (a) (2) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U. S. C. 1484 (a) (2)) shall not apply to Mrs. Madeleine Alice Aquarone, a citizen of the United States, for such time as the employment of her husband, Stanislas Aquarone, by the International Court of Justice at The Hague, The Netherlands, is the reason for her continued residence abroad: *Provided*, That Mrs. Aquarone begins to reside permanently in the United States prior to the expiration of 1 year after the termination of such employment.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MATTHEW J. BERCKMAN

The Clerk called the bill (S. 827) for the relief of Matthew J. Berckman.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Matthew J. Berckman, of Jersey City, N. J., the sum of \$16,119.76, in full satisfaction of his claim against the United States for furnishing information which led to the discovery, and forfeiture to the United States, of gold bullion, valued at \$171,197.60, about to be shipped unlawfully out of the United States: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CHARLES T. DOUDS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2634) for the relief of Charles T. Douds.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Charles T. Douds, Englewood, N. J., the sum of \$12,229.66. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of the said Charles T. Douds against the United States for losses in compensation he sustained, and expenses he incurred, as the result of his removal and separation without pay from his position as regional director, region 2, National Labor Relations Board, effective February 20, 1945. On February 27, 1947, he was restored to his position, after the United States Civil Service Commission, upon appeal from the Board's removal action, had concluded that the evidence on record did not justify his removal and recommended his restoration. No part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 6, strike out the sum and insert "\$10,777.06."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GEORGE JAPHET

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2636) for the relief of George Japhet.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he hereby is, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to George Japhet, of New York, N. Y., the sum of \$1,000. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of the said George Japhet against the United States for reimbursement of collateral furnished upon a surety bond of the Fidelity & Deposit Co. of Maryland to the United States given upon the admission of Gabriella Japhet to the United States for medical treatment, which bond was subsequently forfeited: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MARTIN G. SCOTT AND HANNA VON GUSMANN

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2666) for the relief of Martin G. Scott and Hanna von Gusmann.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Martin G. Scott the sum of \$354.50; and to Hanna von Gusmann the sum of \$776. Such sums are designated in full satisfaction of such employees' claims against the United States for compensation for reasonable and necessary personal property lost while in the course of their duties as a result of war and conditions resulting from war, which claims have been considered and approved by the Secretary of the Treasury upon the recommendations of a Treasury Claim Board: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ROBERT F. SUCZEK

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4699) for the relief of Robert F. Suczek.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That Robert F. Suczek, of 3301 Betty Lane, Lafayette, Calif., be, and he is hereby, relieved of all liability to refund to the United States the sum of \$333.20. Such sum represents overpayment in subsistence allowance made to said Robert F.

Suczek, through an error on the part of the Veterans' Administration.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LT. COL. RICHARD ORME FLINN, JR.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4735) for the relief of Lt. Col. Richard Orme Flinn, Jr.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Comptroller General of the United States is hereby authorized and directed to relieve Lt. Col. Richard Orme Flinn, Jr., Chaplain Corps, United States Army Reserve, serial No. O-260011, of all liability to refund the sum of \$5,440.80. Such sum represents overpayment of increased rental and subsistence allowances on the account of a dependent child (his ward, Thomas Jack Wheeler) for the period of March 26, 1942, through February 18, 1946.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COL. HENRY M. DENNING ET AL.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4996) for the relief of Col. Henry M. Denning, and others.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That relief is hereby granted the various disbursing officers of the United States or claimants hereinafter mentioned in amounts shown herein, said amounts representing amounts of erroneous payments made by said disbursing officers of public funds for which said officers are accountable or amounts due said claimants as listed in and under the circumstances described in identical letters of the Secretary of the Army to the Speaker of the House of Representatives and chairman, Committee on Armed Services, United States Senate.

SEC. 2. That the Comptroller General of the United States be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to credit in the accounts of the following officers and employees of the Army of the United States the amounts set opposite their names: Col. Henry M. Denning, Finance Corps (now retired), \$133.77; Col. C. K. McAllister, Finance Corps, \$39.79; Col. Frank Richards, Finance Corps (now retired), \$34.69; Col. H. R. Cole, Corps of Engineers, \$18.72, the said amounts representing erroneous payments of public funds for which these persons are accountable, resulting from minor errors in determining amounts of pay and allowances due former members of the Civilian Conservation Corps, former officers, enlisted men, and civilian employees of the Army or contractors from whom collection of the overpayments cannot be effected, and which amounts have been disallowed by the Comptroller General of the United States.

SEC. 3. That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Maj. Paul M. Birkeland, Artillery, \$500; 1st Lt. Maurice A. Berg, Air Force, \$108; 2d Lt. Charles Nuckols, Jr., class A agent officer for Lt. Col. Julius S. Eberstein, Finance Corps, \$48.75; 1st Lt. Austin E. Pritchard, Air Force, \$121; 1st Lt. Irwin D. Bingham, Air Force, \$330; 1st Lt. Charles F. Schwep, Signal Corps, \$276; 1st Lt. Henry Fontenot, Ordnance Corps, \$100; Capt. B. D. Grossman, Finance Corps, \$50; 1st Lt. Harold B. Cockrell, Infantry, class A

agent officer for Maj. W. F. Menegus, Finance Corps, \$436; W. O. (Jr.) Gregory W. Corken, class B agent officer for Maj. E. A. Ganschow, Finance Corps, \$30.26; Capt. Francis S. Chasm, Infantry, \$181.36; in full satisfaction of the claim of each such claimant against the United States for a like amount.

Sec. 4. That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the PG Publishing Co., Pittsburgh, Pa., \$218.40; Cleveland Plain Dealer, Cleveland, Ohio, \$206.38; the Indianapolis Star, Indianapolis, Ind., \$260.04; the Dispatch Printing Co., Columbus, Ohio, \$188.16; the Cincinnati Enquirer, Cincinnati, Ohio, \$321.30; Times-Herald, Washington, D. C., \$60.90; the Courier-Journal and the Louisville Times Co., Louisville, Ky., \$78.75; the Madison Courier, Madison, Ind., \$4.50; the Marion Star, Marion, Ohio, \$11.76; the Toledo Blade Co., Toledo, Ohio, \$50.40; the Columbus Dispatch, Columbus, Ohio, \$47.88; the Tribune Co., Chicago, Ill., \$138.60; Tribune-Star Publishing Co., Inc., Terre Haute, Ind., \$15.12; the New York Sun, Inc., New York, \$99.63; the LaPorte Printing Co., LaPorte, Ind., \$24.32; the Chicago Daily News, Inc., Chicago, Ill., \$69.30; the News-Journal Co., Wilmington, Del., \$16.80; the Philadelphia Record Co., Philadelphia, Pa., \$63; Indianapolis News Publishing Co., Indianapolis, Ind., \$52.48; the New York Times Co., New York, \$138.60; Richmond Publishing Co., Richmond, W. Va., \$8; Elkins Inter-Mountain Co., Inc., Elkins, W. Va., \$8.82; West Virginia Newspaper Publishing Co., Morgantown, W. Va., \$16.80; the Athenaeum, Morgantown, W. Va., \$6.60; Clarksburg Publishing Co., Clarksburg, W. Va., \$12.50; Grant County Press, Petersburg, W. Va., \$9.98; Mineral Daily News-Tribune, Kayser, W. Va., \$12.60; Advocate Messenger Co., Danville, Ky., \$2.40; New York Journal American, New York, N. Y., \$45.40; the Newspaper Advertising Service, Madison, Wis., \$25.20; the Journal Co., Milwaukee, Wis., \$46.20; the Shopper's Guide, J. Schilling and J. Holton, publishers, Baraboo, Wis., \$4.95; the Sauk County News, Prairie DuSac, Wis., \$5; and the Albert Hand Co., Cape May, N. J., \$16.30, which amounts are due the several publishing companies mentioned above for advertising ordered and published for and in the interest of the United States without the prior approval of the Secretary of War as required by Revised Statutes 3828 (44 U. S. C. 324): *Provided*, That no person shall be held pecuniarily liable for any amount on account of the above-mentioned payments.

Sec. 5. That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the township of Montgomery, Harlingen, N. J., \$199.31, and the township of Hillsborough, Neshanic, N. J., \$136.44, which amounts are due to the townships mentioned above for cost and legal fees incurred in the enactment of local ordinances which were enacted at the behest of the military authorities at the Belle Mead Army Service Forces Depot, Somerville, N. J., for reasons of military security: *Provided*, That no persons shall be held pecuniarily liable for any amount on account of the above-mentioned payments.

Sec. 6. That any amounts refunded by any disbursing officers or his heirs in connection with any item of indebtedness in accounts cleared herein and/or any amount otherwise due any disbursing officer or his heirs which was set off against any item of indebtedness in the accounts which are cleared herein, shall be refunded to said disbursing officer or his heirs: *Provided*, That no part of the amounts authorized herein to be credited in the accounts of the disbursing officer shall be charged against any individual other than the various payees.

Sec. 7. That in all cases where disbursing officers' accounts are cleared or relieved under the authority of this or any other act,

such clearance or relief shall be considered and construed as precluding the recovery of any interest charged from said disbursing officer arising from any items so cleared or relieved, whether such interest charges are in connection with judicial proceedings or otherwise.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

HENRY C. BUSH

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 5765) for the relief of Henry C. Bush and other Foreign Service officers.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to each of the following officers and employees of the Foreign Service of the United States the sum designated in full satisfaction of such officer's or employee's claim against the United States for compensation for reasonable and necessary personal property lost while in the course of his duties as a result of war and conditions resulting from war:

Henry C. Bush, \$6,000; Anna Charlton, \$2,656.50; Thomas J. Cory, \$85; Edna B. Crilley, \$204.50; Robert B. Dreessen, \$631; Hubert F. Ferrell, \$1,000; Helene E. Fischer, \$1,000; Christine M. Hardy, \$462.50; Clive E. Knowlson, \$851; Edwin W. Martin, \$2,506.15; Donald B. McCue, \$1,300.98; Evelyn B. Mitchell, \$222.50; Josef L. Norris, \$141.50; Vincoe M. Paxton, \$1,010.50; Bertrand L. Pinsonnault, \$73.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 2, line 8, after "§73" insert a colon and the following: "George H. Earle, III, \$12,830: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ESTATE OF JAMES FRANCIS NICHOLSON

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 6020) for the relief of the estate of James Francis Nicholson.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the estate of James Francis Nicholson, the sum of \$2,274, in full settlement of all claims against the United States for the amount of the check No. 12,331,785, dated May 10, 1951, which was made payable to James Francis Nicholson on account of war claim due but which, because of his absence from home, was not received by him before his death and was re-

turned to the Treasury for cancellation: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COLUMBIA HOSPITAL OF RICHLAND COUNTY, S. C.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 6477) for the relief of the Columbia Hospital of Richland County, S. C.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That (a) the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the Columbia Hospital of Richland County, S. C., the sum of \$18,322.92. Such sum represents reimbursement for the reasonable and necessary expenses incurred by such hospital in providing care and treatment during the period beginning September 18, 1942, and ending October 18, 1952, to one Halsford V. Sharpe, a former prisoner of the United States who is permanently and totally disabled as a result of an injury sustained by him in the course of his arrest on March 7, 1942, by agents of the Alcohol Tax Unit, Bureau of Internal Revenue, Department of the Treasury, and who was placed in such hospital by such agents on such date. The United States, through the Department of Justice, paid all expenses for such care and treatment for the period beginning March 7, 1942, and ending September 17, 1942, during which period the said Halsford V. Sharpe was in the custody of a United States marshal but, on the latter date, the said Halsford V. Sharpe was discharged from such custody and the United States disclaimed further liability in law to pay such expenses.

(b) After reference of the matter to the United States Court of Claims by House Resolution 404, 82d Congress, agreed to on October 4, 1951, such court in the congressional reference case styled Columbia Hospital of Richland County against the United States (Congressional No. 17872, decided July 13, 1953) determined (1) that there was a moral obligation on the part of the United States to compensate the Columbia Hospital of Richland County, S. C., for the reasonable and necessary expenses incurred by such hospital in the care and treatment of the said Halsford V. Sharpe, (2) that the sum of \$18,322.92 is the amount of such expenses for the period beginning September 18, 1942, and ending October 18, 1952, and (3) that the United States should compensate such hospital for all such expenses occurring after the end of such period or, in lieu thereof, should arrange the transfer of the said Halsford V. Sharpe to a Federal institution properly equipped to care for him on a permanent basis.

(c) In accordance with such determination of the court, the Secretary of the Treasury and the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare are authorized and directed to make such arrangements as may be necessary and appropriate (1) to effect the transfer of the said Halsford V. Sharpe, on the earliest practicable date, from the Columbia Hospital of Richland County, S. C., to any hospital under the jurisdiction of the Public Health Service, Department of Health,

Education, and Welfare, which is properly equipped to receive and care for the said Halsford V. Sharpe, and (2) to provide care and treatment on a permanent basis for the said Halsford V. Sharpe in such hospital under the jurisdiction of the Public Health Service. The Secretary of the Treasury is further authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the Columbia Hospital of Richland County, S. C., a sum equal to the amount which shall be certified by such hospital to the United States Court of Claims, and shall be approved and certified by such court to the Secretary of the Treasury, as being the amount of the reasonable and necessary expenses incurred by such hospital in providing for the care and treatment of the said Halsford V. Sharpe during the period beginning October 19, 1952, and ending on the day immediately prior to the date of the transfer of the said Halsford V. Sharpe to the hospital under the jurisdiction of the Public Health Service as provided for in this subsection.

(d) The payments to the Columbia Hospital of Richland County, S. C., of the sums referred to in subsections (a) and (c) and the transfer of the said Halsford V. Sharpe to a hospital under the jurisdiction of the Public Health Service for care and treatment therein on a permanent basis as provided for in subsection (c) shall be in full settlement of all claims against the United States for reimbursement of expenses incurred in connection with the care and treatment of the said Halsford V. Sharpe.

(e) No part of either of the sums appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with the claim or portion thereof settled by the payment of such sum, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LIVIO BRIANESCO

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 6594) for the relief of Livio Brianesco.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Livio Brianesco, Cleveland, Ohio, the sum of \$59.12. Such sum represents the amount of the judgment and costs for which the said Livio Brianesco was held liable on June 1, 1953, in a civil action in the municipal court of Cleveland, as the result of an accident which occurred on West 77th Street, between Madison and Franklin Avenues, in Cleveland on January 29, 1953, and which involved a United States mail truck being driven by the said Livio Brianesco, a letter carrier in the United States Post Office, Cleveland, Ohio. Such sum shall be paid only on condition that the said Livio Brianesco shall use such sum, or so much thereof as may be necessary, to pay such judgment and costs in full: *Provided,* That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon

conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LAURA SMITH MERRITT

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 7407) for the relief of Mrs. Laura Smith Merritt.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Mrs. Laura Smith Merritt, Camden, Ala., the sum of \$402.63. Payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims against the United States for reimbursement of transportation expenses incurred by the said Mrs. Laura Smith Merritt in traveling from Frankfurt, Germany, to Washington, D. C., on October 18 and 19, 1950: *Provided,* That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 6, strike out "\$402.63" and insert: "\$306.08."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ROBERT E. LEIBBRAND

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 5772) for the relief of Robert E. Leibbrand.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That Robert E. Leibbrand, Seattle, Wash., is hereby relieved of all liability to refund to the United States the sum of \$960. Such sum represents the amount of the class E allotment payments which were erroneously made to Rose Leibbrand, the sister of the said Robert E. Leibbrand, during the period beginning November 1, 1942, and ending October 31, 1945, after the said Robert E. Leibbrand had discontinued such allotment. In the audit and settlement of the accounts of any certifying or disbursing officer of the United States full credit shall be given for the amount for which liability is relieved by this act.

Mr. JONAS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I offer a committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment offered by Mr. JONAS of Illinois: Page 1, line 3, after "Leibbrand" insert "and Rose Leibbrand"; and in the same line strike out the word "is" and insert in lieu thereof "are."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

Amend the title so as to read: "For the relief of Robert E. Leibbrand and Rose Leibbrand."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ESTATE OF MRS. MARGARETH WEIGAND

The Clerk called the bill (S. 502) for the relief of the estate of Mrs. Margareth Weigand.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the President, or the officer or agency designated by him pursuant to the provisions of section 32 of the Trading With the Enemy Act (U. S. C., title 50, App. sec. 32), shall transfer and deliver to the estate of Mrs. Margareth Weigand the amount payable to her under the Social Security Act as a result of the death of her late son, Kurt F. Weigand, which amount was, in accordance with the provisions of the Trading With the Enemy Act, vested in or transferred to the Attorney General by vesting order No. 17973.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GEORGE L. F. ALLEN

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1325) for the relief of George L. F. Allen.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the two provisos of paragraph 1 of part VIII of Veterans Regulation No. 1 (a) setting time limits for the initiation and termination of education or training under such part VIII shall not apply to George L. F. Allen, of McAllen, Tex., if he initiates his education or training under such part VIII within 120 days after the date of enactment of this act. Upon the said George L. F. Allen so initiating his education or training under such part VIII, he shall be held and considered to have been eligible for education or training under such part beginning October 17, 1951, the date on which he actually commenced his education or training. The Administrator of Veterans' Affairs shall reimburse the said George L. F. Allen for tuition, subsistence allowances, and other expenses related to his education or training which would have been paid him under paragraphs 5 (a) and 6 (a) of such part VIII if he had been eligible on and after October 17, 1951, and shall make the appropriate deduction of time from the period of eligibility of the said George L. F. Allen.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PUERTO RICAN INDIGNATION

Mr. THOMPSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. THOMPSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, there came to my desk this morning a letter from an old friend in my home town. For himself and the other Puerto Ricans living in our country he spoke out in horrified indignation

over the action of the unfortunate fanatics who endangered the lives of people whom he regarded as friends of mankind. I assured my friend that we here in this great body do not in any degree blame this unfortunate affair on the good people of his native land. It is my privilege to place in the RECORD my friend's letter and my reply:

THE JOURNEMEN
BARBERS, HAIRDRESSERS,
COSMETOLOGISTS AND PROPRIETORS
INTERNATIONAL UNION OF AMERICA,
LOCAL No. 100,
Galveston, Tex., March 3, 1954.

HON. CLARK W. THOMPSON,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR CLARK: We are deeply hurt in view of the present headlines; and we, the Puerto Ricans residing in Galveston County, Tex., wish to express to you and your fine colleagues our sincere regrets. We also wish to extend our best wishes for the speedy recovery of those five great Americans who were seriously injured during the foulest attempt made on the lives of the people like you, who are devoting the best years of their lives for the best interests of people all over the world. It is beyond our comprehension how any person or persons could carry out such a foul attempt.

We unanimously recommend that new legislation be passed, providing that whereas any person or persons, making an attempt on the lives of any Member or Members of the Senate or the House of Representatives while in execution of their duties, upon conviction of said offense, shall be sentenced to death. Any other punishment would be inadequate.

We shall be more than glad to cooperate with any agency of the United States Government, at any time, in exposing any Puerto Rican Nationalist or any Communist.

Looking forward to seeing you on your next visit to our great city, I remain, as ever,
Your loyal friend,

JOE
J. E. Casals.

MARCH 4, 1954.

Mr. J. E. CASALS,
Galveston, Tex.:

I am deeply touched by your fine letter of March 3. Please assure all of the Puerto Ricans in our home county that my colleagues and I understand and appreciate their complete loyalty to our mutual country. I am placing your letter in today's CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

CLARK W. THOMPSON,
Member of Congress.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. H. CARLANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Obviously a quorum is not present.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 24]

Abbott	Chatham	Fulton
Barrett	Chelf	Gamble
Bentley	Chudoff	Gary
Bolton	Clardy	Granahan
Oliver P.	Davis, Tenn.	Green
Brownson	Dawson, Ill.	Hardy
Buckley	Dingell	Harrison, Va.
Campbell	Elliott	Hart
Carnahan	Fallon	Holifield
Celler	Forrester	Javits

Jensen	Pillion	Stringfellow
Kearns	Powell	Sutton
Krueger	Reed, Ill.	Taylor
Lanham	Rivers	Tuck
Lantaff	Roberts	Vursell
Miller, N. Y.	Roosevelt	Warburton
Morgan	Shelley	Weichel
Morrison	Sieminski	Winstead
Moulder, Mo.	Smith, Va.	

The SPEAKER. Three hundred and seventy-nine Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. STAGGERS asked and was given permission to address the House for 5 minutes today, following any special orders heretofore entered.

FRANKLIN JIM

Mr. JONAS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 1883) for the relief of the legal guardian of Franklin Jim, a minor, with a Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment:

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Page 1, lines 5 and 6, strike out "the legal guardian of Franklin Jim, a minor" and insert "Franklin Jim, a."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

STEBBINS CONSTRUCTION CO.

Mr. JONAS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 1967) for the relief of the Stebbins Construction Co., with a Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Page 1, lines 3 and 4, strike out "Federal District Court of" and insert "United States District Court for."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

BRACEY-WELSH CO., INC.

Mr. JONAS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 3275) for the relief of the Bracey-Welsh Co., Inc., with a Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Page 2, line 3, after "claim", insert "": Provided, That no part of the amount appro-

priated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RELIEF OF CERTAIN DISBURSING OFFICERS

Mr. JONAS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 2567) to amend the act of July 26, 1947 (61 Stat. 493), relating to the relief of certain disbursing officers, with Senate amendments thereto, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Page 1, line 8, strike out "Army, Navy, and Air Force Departments" and insert "Department of the Army, Department of the Navy, Department of the Air Force, and of the Coast Guard."

Page 2 line 10, strike out "or the Secretary of the Air Force" and insert "the Secretary of the Air Force, or the Secretary of the Treasury."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were concurred in, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

STATE, JUSTICE, AND COMMERCE APPROPRIATION BILL, FISCAL YEAR 1955

Mr. CLEVENGER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 8067) making appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce, and the United States Information Agency, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1955, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 8067, with Mr. JOHNSON of California in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

Mr. COON. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. COON:
Page 39, line 24, strike out "\$10,000,000" and insert "\$15,000,000."

Page 40, line 1, strike out "\$1,600,000" and insert "\$6,600,000."

Mr. COON. Mr. Chairman, the \$10 million recommended in this bill for the

forest-highway program next year would be used chiefly to pay for contracts already let, with little or no money to spend for new construction. The effect of this would be to practically stop the program.

The \$10 million figure in the present bill represents a cut of 33 percent from the \$15 million originally requested by the Bureau of Public Roads. This amount was reduced in the office of the Secretary of Commerce.

I believe we should spend at least the amount of the Bureau of Public Roads request this year, so I am proposing in my amendment an increase of \$5 million.

In fiscal 1953, \$20 million was authorized by the United States Congress for forest highways. In fiscal 1954, \$22.5 million was authorized, and in fiscal 1955, the authorization is \$22.5 million. This is a total of \$65 million authorized, while the amount actually appropriated so far totals only \$11.6 million. The amount authorized but unappropriated is \$43.4 million.

Eighty-seven percent of the national forests are located in 11 western States. Timber production from these forests is important to the economy of these States, and forest highways are important to timber production, as well as being necessary links in the State highway systems.

I want to point out that the Federal forests are one of the agencies of the Federal Government which pays it own way. Last year revenues from the forests came to \$75 million. Of this, approximately \$18 million went back to the counties in lieu of taxes, and another \$7.5 million was spent on access roads leading into the main roads. This leaves a balance of about \$50 million which went back to the United States Treasury to be spent for other things, such as foreign aid, while forest highways did not even receive the amount authorized for them.

In the case of my own State, Oregon, I understand the Government received \$15.6 millions in timber revenues in 1953, while returning only about \$2.7 millions in forest highway funds.

It is well known that the Federal Government owns better than 53 percent of the land in the 11 western States—Arizona, California, Colorado, Idaho, Montana, Nevada, New Mexico, Oregon, Utah, Washington, and Wyoming. This ownership puts the Government in the position of landlord. If this "landlord" is to continue taking revenues from our area, then he must invest the amount required to keep the revenue coming, and he should do his part to pay for the facilities he shares with other users. The forest highway program must be continued if these two purposes are to be served.

I understand that in the 4 western States, Oregon, Washington, Idaho, and Montana, there are about 5 billion feet of timber which has been infested with insects. If we have adequate roads, we can salvage that timber. If we do not have the roads soon this infested timber will die and rot. Every dollar spent in the near future on a Federal forest road or trail will return dollars in salvaged timber that would otherwise be wasted.

President Eisenhower said in his state of the Union message that it will be necessary to continue the 2-cent gasoline tax if we are to have the expanded highway program necessary to get a safe and adequate highway system. I cannot see much logic in taxing on the one hand to build roads, and on the other hand spending for other purposes the money our forest roads bring in.

Good forest highways, making possible more timber production at lower cost, will mean greater economic stability for the communities of the West, higher employment, and more prosperity.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to read some of the questions and answers with reference to this matter found on page 295 of the hearings:

Mr. COON. You say the estimate of \$10 million will be required primarily to liquidate contracts incurred in prior years. Then how much will there be available this year for additional contracts?

In answer to that question Mr. CURTISS said:

Substantially none for new contracts in 1955.

Then I asked the question:

But there will be no new contracts let?

He said:

Not during 1955 under this appropriation.

Then I asked him further:

Then actually what you are doing is completely stopping this program; is that right?

Mr. CURTISS said:

That is approximately it.

Mr. PRESTON said:

You had a little difficulty getting it out.

I believe it would be unfair to our western States, retarding to the development of our timber resources, false economy in the long run, and contrary to the spirit of the President's highway program to appropriate less than the \$15 million requested by the Bureau of Public Roads for forest highways next year.

Mr. MACK of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, when the Public Works Committee 2 years ago brought forth a highway authorization bill it proposed that \$575 million be expended for general highway construction. The money was to be divided between primary, secondary, and urban roads. That money it proposed should be divided one-third on the basis of population, one-third on the basis of area, and one-third on the basis of miles of road.

Included in this bill was a provision that \$22,500,000 should be authorized for the construction of Federal forest highways. This \$22,500,000 was authorized and was to be an integral part of the primary highway system of the Nation. This \$22,500,000 was to be divided among the States with this forest land on the basis of 50-50, the States paying the cost of the construction of these highways. This \$22,500,000 was in a way sort of an in lieu payment, in place of the taxes the States lost by the Federal Government's owning so much forest land.

The Forest Service has jurisdiction over 160 million acres of forest land that is owned by the Federal Government. This 160 million acres of forest land constitutes an area approximately as large as the entire State of Texas.

The Public Works Committee, in 1950, asked for \$22,500,000 for forest highways and the Appropriations Committee later approved \$22,500,000. In 1951 the Appropriations Committee reduced the amount to \$20 million. This committee reduced it the next year to \$18 million, last year to \$15 million, and this year to \$10 million.

We think at least \$15 million should be spent on the Federal primary forest highways this year on a 50-50 matching-fund basis. We think we ought to have at least \$15 million for that purpose.

Forest highways are the roads that go from city to city to serve the general traveling public. A forest highway is a primary highway, not secondary, not urban, but a primary highway. The Federal Government contributes some millions, and the State matches those funds.

Mr. COUDERT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MACK of Washington. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. COUDERT. Are these forest highways financed in the same way as the Federal-aid highways?

Mr. MACK of Washington. The Federal Government supplies 50 percent of the money and the States match the 50 percent to build the highways. That is my understanding.

Mr. COUDERT. I beg the gentleman's pardon. I think the gentleman may be in error on that. That is why I raised the issue. I have before me the statement of the Director of the Highways Bureau in which he says:

I feel that the forest highways program could be prosecuted more expeditiously if financed in the same way as Federal-aid highways. I plan to explore this matter thoroughly with Commissioner du Pont and the Bureau of the Budget.

It seems to me that if there is in process a program that may lead to a different method of financing these roads, it might be wise to leave this budget estimate alone and not add to it at this time.

Mr. MACK of Washington. The gentleman may be right in that statement.

These highways serve the primary road system. In addition these roads enable loggers who buy Government timber to get it out more easily. This places these loggers in competition with other timber buyers, with the result that the Federal Government secures a higher price for its timber. Also, these highways provide firefighting facilities which facilitate getting men and equipment to the scene of a fire. These highways, also make it easier for the Federal Government to log diseased timber or timber damaged by fire.

Mr. DEWART. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MACK of Washington. I yield to the gentleman from Montana.

Mr. DEWART. In addition, when we do not have funds adequate to build the proper roads inside the forest, when you come to a poor piece of road it closes the

circuit all the way because of that poor piece.

Mr. MACK of Washington. It affects 160 million acres of Government forest land situated in 45 of the 48 States of the Union.

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MACK of Washington. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. HORAN. It is my understanding that these roads will help to salvage some \$25 million worth of blown timber in the gentleman's own area.

Mr. MACK of Washington. We had a forest fire in 1951 in the district of the gentleman from Washington [Mr. WESTLAND] that destroyed half a billion feet of timber. The timber damaged by this fire was valued at \$5 million. Today, because of that forest fire, it is worth only \$2 million. Not a stick of that \$2 million worth of damaged timber could have been salvaged except for the Federal forest highways being built in that area.

Mr. HORAN. The reason these are not matching funds is that they are payment in lieu of taxes to the States.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Washington has expired.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Washington may be permitted to continue for an additional 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MACK of Washington. I yield.

Mr. GAVIN. I intend to support this amendment offered by the gentleman from Washington. The question I would like to ask is, Are we not impeding the sustained-yield program in our national forests because of the lack of roads to get into the forest areas? Is that not correct?

Mr. MACK of Washington. We are impeding the primary highway construction of the Nation. We are retarding the salvaging of timber damaged as the result of fires and bug infestation. We are limiting the opportunities of the Forest Service to get into those areas with men and equipment to fight fires. We are hampering the Federal Government in its logging of diseased or bug-infested timber.

Mr. GAVIN. The gentleman referred to the appropriations in the past of \$22,500,000. Would he mind repeating those figures and bringing them down to the present appropriation?

Mr. MACK of Washington. In 1950 the appropriation for the forest Federal highways was \$22,500,000. In 1951 that was reduced to \$19 million. Last year it was reduced to \$15 million. This year it is being reduced by the recommendations of the Committee on Appropriations to \$10 million. In other words, the program is being gradually done away with, although it is a self-supporting program by reason of the savings made by salvaging of the timber.

Mr. GAVIN. I think this restoration of \$5 million by the amendment offered

by the gentleman should be accepted by the House. It is very important.

Mr. CLEVINGER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MACK of Washington. I yield.

Mr. CLEVINGER. I just want to correct the last statement. This is the action of the Secretary of Commerce. The committee did nothing with it. This is a budget recommendation.

Mr. MACK of Washington. I recognize that the Budget Bureau has recommended only \$10 million for this year. I understand that the Forest Service asked for \$15 million.

Mr. CLEVINGER. It was not the action of the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. MACK of Washington. No; the committee is carrying out the instructions of the Budget Director. That is correct.

Mr. SCUDDER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MACK of Washington. I yield.

Mr. SCUDDER. Is it not a fact that the curtailment of the expenditures on our forest highways is curtailing the harvesting of overripe timber and getting it to the mills and from the mills into the markets? The thing that we have been working for, as you well know, is to develop more forest highways because with better highways the Federal Government will receive more stumpage fees for timber which they own and, therefore, it will come back into another pocket of the Federal Government. I believe that for every dollar that we spend for these highways the Federal Government will get back \$5.

Mr. MACK of Washington. The gentleman is absolutely correct. If you build forest highways into the timber, it increases the competition among bidders for that timber. The Government, as a result, receives a higher price for its timber; also, the building of these roads facilitates the removal from the forest of overripe timber which otherwise would rot and go to waste.

Mr. HOLMES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MACK of Washington. I yield.

Mr. HOLMES. I congratulate the gentleman from Washington on the remarks that he is making concerning this amendment. I want to go on record as supporting the amendment of the gentleman from Oregon, the Honorable SAM COON. I appreciate very much hearing the remarks of the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GAVIN] in support of this amendment. I am happy to see the interest of the State of Pennsylvania corresponding with the interest of the Far West in this particular matter.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MACK of Washington. I yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Who gets the money for the salvaged timber?

Mr. MACK of Washington. The Federal Government gets the money because the Federal Government owns the timber.

Mr. MUMMA. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MACK of Washington. I yield.

Mr. MUMMA. I do not want to strike a discordant note exactly, but there is an alternative proposition to getting these roads built. Is it not a matter of fact or a matter of record that when they let logging contracts they include a proviso—I do not know whether it is done in every case, but it has been done and it is being done.

Mr. MACK of Washington. The gentleman from Pennsylvania is talking about roads and trails.

Mr. MUMMA. No. I am talking about roads. There is a big difference.

Mr. MACK of Washington. The Federal forest highway is built to serve the traveling public from town to town.

Mr. MUMMA. I understand, but there can be two interpretations, and one group is talking about roads to get logs out. All these logs are not along the primary highways.

Mr. MACK of Washington. I would say to the gentleman the Federal forest highway, although it is built to serve communities, it does go through the forests. Because of this the loggers build their stub roads to those Federal forest highways. The building of these Federal forest highways on a primary system makes it easier for the logger to get into the timber, and thereby increases the number of bidders for the timber. This results in the Government getting a higher price for its timber.

Mr. MUMMA. That could not be true in all cases.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Washington [Mr. MACK] has again expired.

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I am rising in support of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. COON]. My district, which comprises over one-third of the total area of California runs from the Oregon line to and including Death Valley, Calif.; 700 miles down the Sierra Nevada Mountains. That district has more national forests than any other district in the country. It comprises all or part of 11 national forests. There are at least six major highways crossing the Sierra Nevada Mountains, bringing traffic from the East to the West and from the West to the East. Large sections of all of those major highways pass through as much as 50 or 100 miles of national-forest lands. How in the world are the people of my State going to get back and forth across those Sierra Nevada Mountains unless they get some help from the Federal Government in building these national-forest highways which are on the primary system.

A good illustration is Highway No. 40, which is the main road running from Reno, Nev., across Donner Summit into the Sacramento Valley, and from there into San Francisco Bay area. That road is clogged up a great part of the time both in summer and worse in winter because it has never been adequately improved. The Bureau of Public Roads has not had the money under current appropriations to get it done. The amount recommended in this bill is simply the termination of that program. Ten million dollars is just enough to take care of the contracts that are already

under consideration and let, and just a little more. The Bureau of Public Roads asked for \$15 million, which is exactly the amount of money it had last year for this purpose, inadequate certainly, but at least the same as we had last year. The Bureau of the Budget, I understand, cut them back \$5 million. The gentleman from Oregon [Mr. COON] has offered an amendment which would put into this bill an additional \$5 million, making the amount equal to the amount of money requested by the Bureau of Public Roads, and the same amount granted in the appropriation last year for this same purpose. I hope that the Committee will see fit to restore these funds, for all the reasons that have been mentioned.

In my State we had practically a civil war over on the coast area, in the district represented by the gentleman from California [Mr. SCUDDER], when load limitations for trucks went on those State highways, and they were forced to pull off their trucks. That is where these roads get into trouble with the lumber industry. They will simply not hold up under that traffic. The load limitations force the lumber trucks off the roads.

With the Federal Government in my State owning 46 percent of the total land area of California, and over 70 percent of my district—in some counties over 90 percent in my district in Federal ownership—it seems to me we are not asking very much of the Federal Government when we ask that they step up as a property owner and help to build some of these roads through the national forest areas.

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ENGLE. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Is it not true there are large stands of timber in these forest holdings which are not accessible because of the lack of roads to reach them?

Mr. ENGLE. Not only that, but they are not accessible because after the logging companies, from their private roads, get on the main stem, they find inadequate road conditions, load limits on the bridges, and that sort of thing.

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. ENGLE. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Is it not true also that good forest cutting practice requires that a lot of timber that cannot now be reached ought to be cut before it spoils?

Mr. ENGLE. We are losing 2 billion feet of timber a year to what I call the Insect Logging Co., that is the timber in our national forests that is eaten up by bugs, and falls due to being overripe. It is a waste of good national resources.

But whatever may be done about that we have a right to point out that the Federal Government as a proprietor, as the owner of 70 percent of the land in the Sierra Nevada region should step up and put up just a little amount of money, and this is a pittance, to build these main roads through the national forest areas.

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, we in Oregon are vitally interested in this problem. Over 52 percent of the lands of Oregon belong to the Federal Government, and some 14 percent of the moneys that come in on these roads from the Federal Treasury goes for these highways running through the Oregon forests.

There are three types of forest land that are benefited in this appropriation: One is the forest timber that has been knocked down by wind and that sort of thing; second is the forest timber that has been stricken with infestation; the third is that injured by fire. These three categories of timber have great value if harvested immediately, but unless they are gotten out in a short time after these troubles take place they are lost.

It is true that these roads about which we are talking here are not the access roads that go back into the deep forests, but they are the trunkline roads that go through the forests which must be used to market this timber.

Last year we allowed \$15 million, for these roads, this year practically nothing. It is true there is \$10 million appropriated in this bill for this purpose, but it is only to meet outstanding commitments and obligations; as I understand absolutely, not \$1 for new construction. It seems to me it is penny-wise and pound foolish for the Federal Government which owns these lands—a big investment of the Federal Government alone—not to provide a minimum appropriation for this purpose to preserve and market our timber.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANGELL. I gladly yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. RABAUT. Just one question: Is this request within the amount allowed by the Bureau of the Budget?

Mr. ANGELL. No; the Bureau of the Budget recommended only \$10 million.

Mr. RABAUT. So this is above the Bureau of the Budget.

Mr. ANGELL. The Forestry Service recommended \$15 million. That was the amount allowed last year.

I hope this Committee will restore the \$5 million in order not to help the people of Oregon but to help the Federal Government itself which owns this great investment.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANGELL. I gladly yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. GAVIN. At times I do not always agree with my friends from the great Northwest, but this is one time that I certainly agree with them in this amendment offered here today. I merely want to observe that I cannot at times understand the thinking of the House. We spend hundreds of millions of dollars all over the world and the membership votes it through with but little or no debate. However, when it comes to our own backyard, I mean the development of our great national forests for the welfare of the people of America, we certainly scrutinize all details. Now, here is a \$5 million item which would

be a contribution to the development of these great forest areas. I sincerely hope that the Members of the House will approach this matter today with the thought that here is something that concerns their own backyard. This amendment should be adopted overwhelmingly.

Mr. ANGELL. I thank the gentleman for his contribution; he is absolutely right.

Mr. DEMPSEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANGELL. My time has about expired.

(On request of Mr. DEMPSEY, and by unanimous consent, Mr. ANGELL was allowed to proceed for 2 additional minutes.)

Mr. DEMPSEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANGELL. I yield to the gentleman from New Mexico, who is very familiar with all of these problems.

Mr. DEMPSEY. I am very happy to support the amendment providing \$5 million additional. The committee, of which the gentleman from Oregon is a member, the Public Works Committee, had this matter under consideration and went into every phase of it. I think he is more familiar with the situation than most Members of the House. A great many people feel that a pine tree when it grows up just stands there until somebody cuts it down, that it does not deteriorate. A tree matures or gets ripe just like fruit gets ripe or wheat gets ripe and unless you harvest it at that time you are going to lose the tree. It is not an economy move to take \$5 million in a proposition of this kind. Our Public Works Committee recommended \$22,500,000. We did the same thing 2 years ago, but at that time the appropriations committee cut it to \$15 million. Now they have cut it to \$10 million and I assume next year they will cut it to \$5 million; at the same time the people of the United States wonder what is happening to our national resources. We are just not protecting them.

It is a cold, hard fact that curtailment of this appropriation is costing the people of the United States many times what has been cut out of the amount originally authorized. Conservative estimates are that the annual loss to the Government in unharvested timber—which has deteriorated and become worthless—is far in excess of \$20 million. Many times that amount is lost to the ravages of forest fires because lack of proper access roads hamper the firefighters. Added to that is the incalculable loss due to destruction of watersheds in the national forests, particularly in the semiarid States where water is their veritable lifeblood.

No, this constant whittling down of forest highways appropriations is the farthest thing imaginable from sound economy.

Mr. ANGELL. Under this bill we are not getting a dime this year for these roads except to take care of the commitments heretofore incurred, not one single penny for future construction of

roads in this great forest area. Last year \$15 million were appropriated for these roads. The Public Works Committee with jurisdiction over roads, of which I am a member, authorized \$22,500,000. I most strongly urge that the motion of the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. Coon], be adopted to increase this item \$5 million, which is the amount appropriated last fiscal year which will provide only \$5 million for new construction.

Mr. COUDERT. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I must oppose the amendment offered by the gentleman from Oregon. Much as I like him, much as I would like to contribute to his happiness and to the happiness of his constituents, despite the fact that the eloquence of the gentleman from California [Mr. Engle] brought tears to my eyes about the plight of those unhappy people struggling across the Sierra Nevada Mountains, despite all of those considerations, the rest of us on this side of the Committee are opposed to this amendment. We are opposed to it for the simple reason that we believe in sustaining the administration's very sound position in seeking to keep down expenditures and to minimize to the greatest extent possible additions to the national debt. If we increase this \$10 million allowed by the Bureau of the Budget by an additional \$5 million, we will simply be contributing an additional \$5 million to the deficit for 1955. We will be increasing the debt and to that extent adding to inflation. After the stirring speech of the ranking member of the minority here yesterday, my colleague from New York [Mr. Rooney], who struggled so hard to save the taxpayers \$17 million, I would expect the minority members of the Committee likewise to oppose this amendment, they now having become exponents of economy and sound fiscal policy.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COUDERT. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. BAILEY. When the House, as it does, approves the proposal to build the St. Lawrence Seaway and obligates the Government to the extent of \$106 million, will that not exceed the debt limit and put us into deficit financing?

Mr. COUDERT. I am not aware that the St. Lawrence Seaway is in this bill. Whatever we do with the St. Lawrence Seaway, the fact will still remain an additional \$5 million added to this bill over and above the Bureau of the Budget figures will increase the deficit for 1955 by just that amount. I trust that the gentleman from New York [Mr. Rooney] will stand with us on this and that the committee may be united in its opposition to this amendment, not that we do not like forests. Of course, we could spend fifty or one hundred million dollars, and I wish we had a billion dollars to spend on them.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COUDERT. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. ROONEY. I must say that the argument of my distinguished friend, the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. Coon], was quite compelling. The gentleman from New York knows what went on in committee with regard to this. The gentleman from New York, the present speaker, offered to increase the amount by a half million dollars. It was refused by the gentleman from Oregon. That is the way the record stands.

Mr. COUDERT. I think the committee would settle for a half million dollars because we like the gentleman from Oregon so much. But I do not believe he would settle for that.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COUDERT. I yield to the gentleman from New Mexico.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. I just want to observe that if the gentleman from California brought tears to the gentleman from New York, he is doing very well.

Mr. MACK of Washington. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COUDERT. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. MACK of Washington. I was informed yesterday by the chairman of the Roads Committee, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. McGREGOR], that we are spending scores of millions of dollars in Europe for the construction of highways under those gift programs. Does not the gentleman from New York believe that it would be better to spend \$5 million upon American highways in the United States rather than scores of millions of dollars in this giveaway foreign-aid program for roads in foreign countries?

Mr. COUDERT. I think that is a very good question, and I would like to answer it.

I would like to say to the gentleman from Washington that he is entirely right. Unhappily, under our present appropriating process, there is no connection between the two, and the right hand knoweth not what the left hand doeth. If we vote \$5 million here today, next week and next month we will vote for roads all over the world. Therefore, I say, Mr. Chairman, if we really want to relate like things to like and if we really want to establish a sound fiscal system for the Government of the United States, then for heaven's sake let us persuade the Committee on Rules to report out my H. R. 2 that ties expenditures to taxation and receipts and puts the House in a position of having to determine in fact whether it is going to give highways to Washington and other States that need them or whether it is going to spend money to build roads in Yucatan or Iran or anywhere else. Without that your question would always be relevant but meaningless in practice.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I wish to take but a minute or two to make some comments with regard to the budget-balancing abracadabra which is happening here on the other side of the aisle. It is really quite amazing and amusing. In this morning's paper a headline reads "House Slashes Subsidy Funds for Airlines." Why, I was under the impression, Mr.

Chairman, and I was here all day yesterday, that the gentlemen on the other side of the aisle added \$17 million to this bill for airline subsidies. That is not a slash in my book. That is a plain plush addition of \$17 million of the taxpayers' money.

Now they are confronted with a real problem. It all emanates from the geniality of the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. Coon], and there are very few of the members of the majority side who care to vote against the \$5 million amendment of the genial and distinguished gentleman from Oregon.

Mr. COUDERT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROONEY. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. COUDERT. I simply want to observe, as all Members of the House observe, that, persuasive as the gentleman from New York may be, whichever side he happens to take for the moment, he did not succeed in fooling the House yesterday and evidently did not succeed in fooling the gentlemen of the press. My compliments to them.

Mr. ROONEY. Surely the gentleman from New York does not mean to imply that I fooled him and the subcommittee and the full 50-member Committee on Appropriations when all, including the gentleman from New York, were unanimous in arriving at the figure of \$23 million for the airline subsidy money, a cut of \$50 million. I wonder what later happened to change their minds about it and caused them to come on the floor without ever bringing the subject before the full committee and have the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. CLEVELAND] offer an amendment to his own bill to add \$17 million of the taxpayers' money. Now, if the gentlemen could figure some way of taking five of those \$17 million in airline subsidies and giving them to the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. Coon] and his associates for their forest highways, I might be agreeable to go along.

Mr. COUDERT. Will the gentleman support my bill H. R. 2, which will tie expenditures to revenues and compel the House to make a choice?

Mr. ROONEY. No; I do not agree with the gentleman from New York in regard to H. R. 2, and I daresay that not too many of his colleagues on his side of the aisle agree with the provisions of H. R. 2, either. After all, if it was the right thing to do—and I understand that this is a Republican House, and that is the party of the gentleman, and the gentleman's party is in control of the committees of the House—why do they not report out the gentleman's bill, H. R. 2, and let us take a look at it?

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, it is really gratifying to see how economy-minded my very good friend from New York, whom I greatly admire, has become in the last several weeks. It is really a creditable performance on economy he is turning in.

Mr. ROONEY. I thank the learned gentleman.

Mr. GAVIN. I think the fact that he has been so closely associated with the

gentleman from New York that it is contagious, and they are both becoming economy minded, in this particular instance.

Mr. COUDERT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GAVIN. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. COUDERT. May I remind the gentleman that my friend the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY] and I are divided by a river, and it is a very sharp division—the East River in New York.

Mr. GAVIN. I assume from what the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY] stated and from what the gentleman from New York [Mr. COUDERT] stated that there may be a river between them in their respective districts, but they are both agreed on opposition to this proposed amendment, and that is what I am concerned about.

Let us examine this Forest Service situation and our national forests. It is really interesting. I might say it is the only branch of the Federal Government that I know of that is turning in a profit. They actually took in about \$12 million more last year than they expended.

In the discussion we had the other day on the legislation relative to exchange of land in the national forests, as to why they have not increased their activities on sustained-yield programs in the national forests, it was evident that they could not increase their programs because of lack of roads in the forests.

If one branch of the Government can show a profit of \$12 million, it certainly is an outstanding performance. It would be creditable if other branches of the Government could emulate that performance. If they can show a greater result by allocating an additional \$5 million to this program, I think this amendment should be adopted.

In my honest opinion, it is a wise investment of the American taxpayers' dollars. My record has been well known on economy ever since I have been here. But this is one program where I do not feel that economy is wise, nor is the cut justified. I do not think the appropriation should be cut back from \$22,500,000 in a couple of years to \$10 million. This is a drastic cut. We are spending hundreds of millions of dollars all over the world; however, when it comes to our own backyard, our own people, our great national forests that are operated profitably and used by hundreds of thousands of people for recreation and other purposes, cuts are made that make forest programs ineffective.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GAVIN. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. ROONEY. Does the gentleman understand that President Eisenhower does not want this \$5 million added to the bill, that his Bureau of the Budget and his Secretary of Commerce submitted a request in the amount of \$10 million, and that that is all they say they want and can use for forest highways?

Mr. GAVIN. We are in disagreement. That is why we are debating it today. In the final analysis, we are the ones

that are going to determine whether the Bureau of the Budget is going to reach conclusions on this program or whether the duly elected representatives of the people are going to reach those conclusions as to what these programs should be.

Mr. COUDERT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GAVIN. I yield.

Mr. COUDERT. Is it not a fact that no matter what we appropriate and no matter how much we appropriate, if the Bureau of the Budget does not authorize the agency to spend the funds, they will not be spent, and therefore even if we give them 15 or 20 or 50 million dollars, if the Bureau of the Budget says \$10 million is all they need this year, that is all that is going to be spent?

Mr. GAVIN. If we appropriate the money to them and then the Bureau of the Budget does not permit them to use it, it is up to us again to take the matter up with the Bureau of the Budget to ascertain reason why. We will get into that later, but I assume from what the gentleman is saying that you are going to vote for the amendment, is that correct?

Mr. COUDERT. No, I am not.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. COON].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mrs. SULLIVAN: On page 26, line 3, change the period to a comma and insert "of which \$10,000 shall be used to renew the compilation of statistics on stocks of coffee on hand."

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Chairman, my amendment, providing for a very modest sum in the appropriation for the Census Bureau to be earmarked for the compilation of statistics, is intended to give to the American Government and to the American people the true facts on the stocks of coffee on hand in the United States. We know that the coffee crop in Brazil was damaged badly last year. We know that there will be, if present rates of consumption of coffee continue, some degree of shortage in the United States. We can expect that coffee prices will continue to go up under those circumstances.

However, we have every right to expect that coffee prices will not go up in anticipation of shortages. That is what happened late last year and earlier this year. From the best information I can obtain, there have been no shortages of coffee in the United States. Over a period of years we have imported more coffee than we have consumed. Yet the price has been shooting up in the grocery stores and every week we are told that another 5-cent-a-pound increase is imminent.

What are the facts about coffee supply—about stocks of coffee on hand? Frankly, we just do not seem to know, at least not accurately. Apparently the only way we can find out, through our investigating committees, is by the subpoena process. That is ridiculous when

we are dealing with a commodity so generally used in the American household—so much enjoyed by the American public.

The Census Bureau did keep statistics on the volume of coffee stocks during the war and for a short period in the late 1940's. It does not keep them at this time. My amendment, earmarking \$10,000 of the appropriation for the Bureau of the Census, would enable the Bureau to renew the compilation of statistics on stocks of coffee on hand. If we are going to prevent speculative price increases resulting from hoarding on the part of some big operators or manipulation, we have got to know how much coffee there is in the United States. The Census Bureau can determine that for us if we give it the funds it needs for this simple operation. If as a result of having this information we can save the housewife an unnecessary increase of as little as 1 cent a pound in the price of coffee, then we are saving the amount of this appropriation many hundreds of times over in the cost of living for the American consumer and in the cost of Government, too, and without asking for any additional money. We must remember that coffee makes up all by itself 1 percent of the Consumers' Price Index. Therefore, it is no minor item in the cost of living formula. And we all know how wages and many other costs are tied to the Consumer Price Index.

If we had had this information—the accurate information—on stocks of coffee on hand last November, I can tell you honestly, Mr. Chairman, that the American housewives would not have been victimized as they were by the tremendous increase in coffee prices on a speculative basis in anticipation of shortages due some time this year. We would have known that there was more coffee in the United States than we were consuming. We would have known that there was no excuse for the price increases which took place. As it was, we did not know what the true facts were, and committees of the House and Senate are still trying to find out, and the more they look into the matter the more they find that speculation was at the heart of the tremendous price increases of the last 5 months.

Mr. Chairman, I urge that any Member who is really concerned about the price of such an important item in the consumers' price index, who is concerned about letters he is receiving from housewives in his district about coffee prices, support this amendment as an effective means of getting the facts on the record, so that we are protected in the future against unnecessary increases in the price of coffee. Think of it, Mr. Chairman, for only \$10,000 we should be able to know, and not have to guess about the volume of coffee stocks on hand in the United States, and we can know then whether any increase in coffee prices is justified by supply factors, or merely by greed. The people are demanding that we do something about coffee prices, and here is an effective means of taking realistic action. I hope the committee will see fit to accept the amendment.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, will the distinguished gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. SULLIVAN. I will be glad to yield.

Mr. ROONEY. If I correctly understand the gentlewoman's amendment, it would not add 1 nickel to the bill; is that correct?

Mrs. SULLIVAN. The gentleman is correct. I am not asking for additional money to be appropriated.

Mr. ROONEY. The gentlewoman's amendment merely allocates \$10,000 of the total in this bill for the Bureau of the Census to go into this matter of coffee, which is a subject of very much concern to the American housewife today.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. That is correct.

Mr. ROONEY. I commend the distinguished and very able gentlewoman from Missouri for offering this amendment, and I assure her that we shall support it.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. I thank the distinguished gentleman from New York.

Mr. DAWSON of Utah. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. SULLIVAN. I yield to the gentleman from Utah.

Mr. DAWSON of Utah. I wanted to inquire of the lady whether or not it would be possible for the Bureau to use this money for this purpose without the amendment which she has offered?

Mrs. SULLIVAN. The authority was vested in the Administrator away back in the 80th Congress, Public Law 671, but they kept those records only during wartime. When I called them about it earlier this year they said that because of lack of money they could not continue to keep them.

Mr. DAWSON of Utah. The point I am making is this. Could they not, without this amendment, use the money already allocated to them for this purpose, without having it earmarked specifically for this purpose?

Mrs. SULLIVAN. The answer is that the appropriation last year was not large enough to continue these records so they did not compile the statistics. If it were indicated to them that we want those figures, that it is the intention of the Congress to have those figures, then they will use the fund to provide them out of their general appropriation.

Mr. DAWSON of Utah. I thank the lady for the explanation.

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

May I say that the committee on this side has no objection to this amendment.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I wish to say that the amendment is entirely satisfactory to the minority members of the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BUSBEY: On page 47, line 16, strike out "\$75,814,000" and insert "\$55,814,000."

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Chairman, this seems to be the day for adopting amendments on an appropriation bill, and I hope that my amendment will not be the first to be defeated. It should be passed for these reasons:

First of all, it is a step toward economy. It is a very—shall I say in the words of our distinguished chairman, the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER], in referring to some cuts—modest cut? It cuts only \$20 million out of the fund for the United States information program. It is a modest cut, because I was afraid the membership of the House would not go along with me if I offered an amendment to cut the fund by a considerable amount—which should be done. For that reason, I offered an amendment for just a very, very modest cut.

Why should this agency be cut? Frankly, notwithstanding the fact that the Appropriations Committee, in the 1954 appropriation bill, gave the agency almost blanket authority to discharge any employee, this agency has done less than any agency in Government to get rid of the old Barrett-Acheson-Truman holdovers, who are in key positions—all the policymaking positions. A new director, Mr. Theodore Streibert of New York, was appointed after Mr. Johnson resigned. As far as I know, Mr. Streibert is a very honorable gentleman. He has had a very distinguished career in the field of radio and television with the Mutual Broadcasting System; but I challenge anyone to show me one single qualification Mr. Streibert possesses for handling an ideological program such as the Voice of America.

The personnel down there is the same old personnel, and they are still running the show. This I will prove later.

On two occasions—in 1952 and 1953—I took the floor of the House to expose one of the leading Communists of the United States, Mr. Bertram Wolfe, who had been the chief of the ideological section of the Voice of America in New York for 4½ years. First of all, I have his Form 57, which is his application for a position in the Voice of America; and I called to the attention of Mr. Streibert, and also to Mr. Philip Young, the Chairman of the Civil Service Commission, the fact that Wolfe had falsified his application for employment in the Government. Before my time runs out, let me say that I hope every Member of this House will read my extension of remarks on this matter. Because it would take me some 40 minutes to explain this entire picture, I intend to extend my remarks. You will find that my remarks expose this whole matter of Bertram Wolfe.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUSBEY. It is always a pleasure to yield to my distinguished chairman.

Mr. TABER. I wonder if the gentleman knows that this man is no longer on the payroll?

Mr. BUSBEY. I know he is no longer on the payroll. I have tried to get Mr. Streibert to fire Wolfe ever since he has been in office. My reasons will be found in my extension of remarks. Last week, just before this appropriation bill was reported, Wolfe was permitted to resign. Mr. Streibert should have fired him. I do not think the man would be off the payroll even at this date, if Mr. Streibert had not known that I was going to bring this matter before the House.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUSBEY. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Has the gentleman any assurances he will not be put back?

Mr. BUSBEY. No, and that is what irks me considerably. Hundreds and hundreds of such employees have been permitted to resign when they should have been fired. Now, Mr. Wolfe told them he disavowed communism in 1929, but my remarks will show that he was an active Communist up until at least 1941.

There is one more thing I desire to bring out. When some former Communist, such as Elizabeth Bentley, Louis Budenz, Ben Gitlow, and others, have broken from the Communist Party, they have come forward and given the agencies of Government and the committees of Congress the benefit of the knowledge and information they gained during their many years of work inside the Communist Party. I defy anyone to show me where they have had one iota of help from Bertram Wolfe.

UNITED STATES INFORMATION AGENCY

Mr. Chairman, the present organizational structure of the United States Information Agency is essentially a product of the key figures and planners of the program under the Democratic administration. Thus, it becomes an instrument for vindicating the Barrett-created empire and protecting the positions and promotions of the key holdovers from the Barrett era.

In a sense, the new director, Theodore Streibert, was forced by the shortage of time to adopt this creation of the holdovers. The interval between his appointment to the directorship in August, and the announcement of the new organization in October and November 1953, did not permit more than cursory analysis of the entire organization.

The shortage of time figured also in the reduction in force of personnel between August and December 31, 1953. Streibert had a mandate to clear out key holdovers from the misguided Barrett regime. Yet, in the final analysis, it was the key holdovers who set up the reduction-in-force program, and recommended the release of certain personnel under the mandate of Public Law 207. Streibert was completely dependent on the holdovers for advice in the reduction in force, which had been underway when he took over, and which was greatly accelerated from the day he took office.

Under those circumstances, it is only natural that the holdovers should protect their own interests.

Nowhere is this better illustrated than in the International Press Service of USIA. Not one of the top leaders of IPS was affected by the reduction-in-force. Some 80 or 90 employees were cut off the IPS roster of 441 employees. Yet none of the top leaders, or any of the Grade 14 and 15 employees, were dropped nor declassified between August and December 1953.

Even though the IPS roster had been cut to nearly the level of November 1950,

it retained nearly twice as many Grade 14 and 15 employees as had been on the rolls before the wild organizational and expansion spree got under way under Barrett in 1950.

Out of the total of 19 grade 14's and 15's, 14 were ex-OWI personnel. One of the Grade 15's had been the Special Assistant to Barrett and ex-Senator Benton in the OWI and post-OWI days. The top man in the International Press Service was an acknowledged life-long Democrat, appointed to his position during the confused transitional period of the ill-fated Robert Johnson regime.

Most of the grade 14 and 15 personnel were either without Civil Service permanent status, or else were recently promoted during the dying days of the Democratic administration. Four of the seven Grade 15's were promoted between September 1952 and February 1953. Nine of the 14 Grade 14's were promoted during this same period.

Three of the grade 15's could have been released under Public Law 207. At least five of the grade 14's could have been dropped by the same law. The remainder could have been reduced to lesser grades commensurate with their abilities, either through reorganization or a combination of reorganization and reduction of the grade 15 and 14 positions. This was not done, however, and the result has been a general debasement of grade 15 and 14 duties and responsibilities in a greatly compressed organization.

Grade 15's and 14's are performing duties once performed by personnel from one to two grades lower, under the standards prevailing in 1950. Some, like the newly appointed Chief of the Far Eastern Branch, have had no previous experience in the specialized fields which they head.

Thus the present organizational structure has been predicated for the most part on the perpetuation of personalities and their promotions. It retains as much as possible of the numerous management and policy empires which grew up like Topsy during the Barrett period of over-expansion and over-grading. This is true on an Agency-wide basis, as well as on the various media and service levels.

What this amounts to, in substance, is that it now costs much more to operate a program which today is less in some respects than the level of 1950. This is particularly true in the case of the International Press Service.

The various components of the International Press Service have been known by many different names since October of 1950, but the fact remains that the products have changed little if any. Yet the output as a whole has declined.

That the production level of the International Press Service has declined is not surprising. October of 1950 represented a key month in the determination of field demand and domestic servicing functions. It was a peak month in the Korean war. The demands from the field, in terms of quantity, represented the capacity of foreign press and publication outlets to absorb materials from International Press Service. Anything beyond the peak level of October

was excess, a glut on the USIS distribution points overseas, which piled up unseen and unused in warehouses until Congressional investigating teams unearthed the surpluses in 1951-52.

Under pressure of the congressional investigations, the information program was reorganized in 1951-52 to give greater emphasis on regional requirements and demand. The reorganization, however, merely compounded the error. It was built on the greatly overstaffed and overgraded organization which had been built up subsequent to November 1950 to turn out voluminous quantities of state-side-created anti-Communist propaganda materials. The empire builders of the Barrett regime simply pyramided an even greater top-heavy organizational structure on top of the grossly overstaffed domestic servicing functions. Each media and servicing function acquired even greater autonomy, with all of the separate management and policy facilities that go with such autonomy.

Close overall operational control declined as media autonomy increased. No strong central office nor personality controlled the field program. Radio, press and publications, and management functions were competing with each other for their share of the time and funds of the overseas program. The USIS field post office in Washington, which should have played the dominant role in establishing the field requirements and coordinating the output, was relegated to the sidelines in the struggle of the radio, press, and management functions for power. Even the Director and Deputy Director of the Agency lost control of the operations of the contending forces. This was borne out time and again in congressional inquiries of the Agency heads.

This lack of control by the Agency heads was attributable, in great measure, to the caliber of the Agency heads, but underlying their own difficulties was an organizational deficiency which was not of their own creation. Dr. Compton, the successor of Barrett, inherited an organizational structure which was designed by his predecessor and was put into operation by leaders recruited under the Barrett regime.

Mr. Streibert inherited the same organization, with the modifications engineered by the same Barrett holdovers during Dr. Johnson's short tenure.

Key personnel, who fully expected to be axed after the inauguration, stayed on to become influential advisers to Johnson. In their possession was the blacklist of personnel whom Barrett has frequently termed "malcontents," and other derogatory labels were applied to persons who had dared to question the policies of his regime. Some of the names of these employees undoubtedly cropped up in a 207 letter when the holdovers could find no way to dismiss them through regular procedures. Some minor employees with good records and civil service status, who had voted the Republican ticket, were cast adrift under the cloud of the 207 letter. They were speeded on their way by New Deal incompetents who had been the most vociferous anti-Republicans.

Those persons who were excluded from the 207 law were sidetracked from reduction-in-force processes through manipulation of the reduction-in-force lists.

In summary, the reorganization has bolstered the status of the hard core of the holdovers, and placed a few Streibert appointees at the top. Whether these few top appointees can prevail against the consolidated position of the holdovers in the face of blanket approval of the program from the White House is extremely doubtful. At this late date they enter the program as defenders. This is reflected in Streibert's statements, and is personified so well in the case of the newly appointed Chief of the International Press Service, Harlan Logan.

Logan took office on January 1, 1954. The reorganization had been completed a month or two earlier, and the justifications of the program and its budget for presentation to Congress in February were well along toward completion. He will be defending an operation and leadership which is little changed from what it was prior to the Presidential election of 1952.

What is the answer to all of this?

Either complete abolishment of the program and a new start, or else a far-reaching efficiency and management study by persons who are influenced by the need, instead of perpetuation of the past.

Whatever the method, the pending transfer of the Voice of America from New York to Washington provides the ideal setting for a thorough revamping of the program. Here is the opportunity to consolidate the numerous overlapping management and policy functions of the several media and services.

The reorganization should center on dividing the Agency into three distinct functions; namely, operations, policy, and management.

Under operations would be placed the complete control of the media servicing the field operations. Media servicing would be made subordinate to field operations.

Policy would be comprised of a small and select staff to advise the Agency Director and the Field Operations Chief.

Management would pull together all of the administrative support functions—budget, personnel, finance, and contract functions—and establish them as a supporting facility for operations, but answerable to the Director of the Agency.

The principal objective of this management, or analyzation division would be to relieve the Field Director of as much policy and administrative responsibilities as possible and to free him for direct day-to-day implementation and control of the informational policies. At his fingertips would be the media services for employment as he saw fit through USIS posts and radio broadcasting facilities. He would be relieved of the purely technical aspects of radio facilities and the mechanics of media transmission in order to concentrate on editorial content and interpretation of policy.

This same separation of editorial and psychological operations from purely management functions would also be

reflected in the individual media functions. Only skeleton administrative staffs would remain in the media services after consolidation in the central management office.

To provide greater attention to the editorial aspects of media and to enable appropriate emphasis and coordination, the media would be divided into fast media and slow media. Under fast media would be radio programing, press, and possibly pictorial functions.

The publications, motion pictures, and general visuals functions which comprise long-range implementation of informational and educational themes would be placed under slow media.

This is a general breakdown of the proposed reorganization of USIA. The detail, of which there would be considerable, would be met with a great deal of resistance because it would effect extensive budget and personnel cuts. But from it would come program coordination which has never been achieved in all of the previous reorganizations.

Mr. Chairman, the United States Information Agency was established during the past year for the express purpose of combatting international communism and to give to the countries of the world a true picture of the United States and its aims, insofar as its aims affect our world position. The Director of the USIA has proposed a budget for the next year of approximately \$89 million. Such diverse subjects as press services, motion-picture services, operation of information centers, maintenance of overseas missions, radio broadcasting, and overhead are provided for in this budget. If this amount of money, or even 10 times this amount of money, gave promise of stopping or slowing down the processes of international communism, the Members of this body would grant the funds without further debate. But the truth is that our information programs overseas are still giving little, if any, positive evidence of accomplishing the basic mission.

In the justification for this budget, the following sentence appears:

Over two-thirds of the United States Information Service budget for fiscal 1955 will be expended to confound communism in Eastern Germany and to prevent its entrenchment in the hearts and habits of the enslaved population.

Mr. Chairman, I submit that the fantastic number of refugees pouring into Western Germany from the East—not only from Eastern Germany, but from the other satellite countries—is clear evidence that communism has failed to find a place in the "hearts and habits of the enslaved population." Let us look into this budget in some detail.

A very great amount of money—some \$6½ million—has been earmarked for the operation of packaging centers and program services in Cairo, Manila, Munich, in Washington, and elsewhere. Of this amount, \$71,000 is provided for Washington—the lowest amount of any of the centers—and yet, it is Washington which is responsible for doing the job.

A qualified committee, headed by Mr. C. D. Jackson, recommended months ago that radio broadcasts to the Soviet Union should be limited to straight news

and explanatory commentaries. Despite this, the Voice of America continues to insist upon program content other than news and commentary, to the detriment of our political aims. While much is made, in the justification for this budget, of the Radio RIAS in Berlin, and particularly of the role of that broadcasting station in maintaining a climate of defiance to the Soviet masters in East Germany; the Americans in charge of the broadcasting station did not hesitate to hire 3 recent employees of the Communist Party just prior to the uprising of last June. Indeed, one man, Eberhardt Schultze, had been a high official of the German Communist Party who spent much of the Hitler period in Moscow. In charge of the so-called East German programs, which are supposed to defeat the effects of Communist propaganda in that country, the man selected for the job was Heinz Frenzel, who, until a year ago, was chief of the district press office of the East German Communist Party in the State of Thuringia. Another commentator selected for a key position in the American broadcasting station in Berlin, Martin Kohl, is also reported to be a former member of the East German Communist Party.

As further evidence of the reluctance of the USIA to divorce itself from personnel presently or recently associated with the International Communist conspiracy, I would like to call your attention to the following:

Mr. Chairman, I can think of no single piece of proposed legislation which would have more far-reaching benefits to the Nation than the President's recommendation that a citizen of the United States, who is convicted in the courts of hereafter conspiring to advocate the overthrow of this Government by force or violence, be treated as having, by such act, renounced his allegiance to the United States and forfeited his United States citizenship.

The very future of our Nation and Government, and the legislative processes which are manifested in this Congress of the United States depend on curbing the doctrine of overthrow of the constitutional government of the United States by minority through armed revolt. Current history has been filled with too many instances of successful capture of governments by minority armed revolt for us to treat the phrase lightly, as was once the custom.

The groundwork for successful armed revolt is laid by just such infiltrations as have been uncovered and highlighted many times in less than a decade. Armed overthrow of the Government and abolishment of every vestige of the Constitution, including the very political-parliamentary system of which the Democratic and Republican Parties are a part, is the aim of Communists, Left-Wing Revolutionary Socialists, and a whole host of liberals, some of whom dwell in the not-too-well-defined realm of internationalism.

Let us not confuse honest social progressiveness, and international cooperation, with the type of liberalism and internationalism which would destroy the very foundations of our constitutional

government. The latter philosophy abandons the very religious, political, and social traditions on which the Constitution was founded.

Yes, Mr. Chairman, I wholeheartedly endorse the President's appeal for the legal weapons to combat the alien philosophy of overthrow of the Government by violence. I might even suggest that the proposed new legislation include some appropriate clause applicable to Government officials who knowingly shelter and defend employees who do, or have admittedly, advocated the overthrow of the United States by armed violence.

Perhaps with some such clause it might be possible to remove from office, or deny future positions of trust to, persons in the United States Information program responsible for the employment of Bertram D. Wolfe, Chief of the Ideological Advisory Staff of the Voice of America.

Bertram Wolfe, from 1919 to at least 1941, advocated, and was affiliated with at least a half dozen revolutionary Socialist and Communist organizations, including the official Communist Party, which advocated overthrow and destruction of the constitutional government by armed violence.

On July 5, 1952, and August 3, 1953, here in this Chamber, I have called attention to Bertram Wolfe's long Communist record and anti-American philosophy, and suggested that a man with his background must certainly have falsified his application for employment with the Voice of America in 1950-51.

Shortly after the adjournment of Congress last August, I confirmed my suspicion that Mr. Wolfe lied in his answer to the question in his Civil Service Commission job application, which reads: "Do you advocate or have you ever advocated, or are you now or have you ever been a member of any organization that advocates the overthrow of the Government of the United States by force or violence?"

Bertram Wolfe boldly admitted that he did advocate just such a philosophy of armed violence, but only until 1929.

Now the truth is that Bertram Wolfe was the leading American teacher of the Marxist-Leninist theory of overthrow of the constitutional Government by violence from 1919 to at least 1941—first, with the Revolutionary Socialists in 1919, then with the American and Mexican Communist Parties from 1919 to 1929, and then with the Jay Lovestone Communist "splinter" organizations from 1929 to 1941. This is documented by Wolfe himself in his many writings and reports on his activities in the Lovestone official publications.

The post-1929 period, which Wolfe excluded from the view of his employers and the Civil Service Commission is his 12-year association with the following Lovestoneite Communist organizations:

Communist Party of the U. S. A., majority group, 1929 to 1932.

Communist Party of the U. S. A., opposition, 1932 to 1937.

Independent Communist Labor League of America, 1937 to 1938.

Independent Labor League of America, 1938 to 1941.

These are the semiunderground Communist organizations which Wolfe excluded from his civil-service application in 1950, and from a Civil Service Review Board in 1952. Under pressure caused by my recent revelations, and questioning by officials of USIA, Wolfe finally acknowledged for the first time, on August 25, 1953, that he retained his basic sympathy for communism until 1939, when his thinking finally underwent a change.

I will prove later in a review of Wolfe's writings and affiliations with the Lovestoneite Communists that even this belated admission of Communist sympathies after 1929 is a gross misrepresentation of his post-1929 activities, but first let us consider for a moment why Wolfe falsely stated to the Civil Service Commission that his advocacy of violent armed overthrow of the United States Government ended in 1929.

For nearly a decade Wolfe had capitalized on the legend that he had resigned from the Communist Party in 1929 and renounced Communism thereafter. As America went through successive stages of anti-Hitlerism and anti-Stalinism, Wolfe's writings on the latter subject developed an additional legend, that he was strongly anti-Communist.

Actually Wolfe did not resign from the Communist Party nor renounce communism in 1929. He and the rest of the Lovestoneites were expelled from their party positions and membership because of their zealous communism and ultra-Marxist-Leninist line of revolutionary international socialism-communism.

From 1929 to 1941, Wolfe and the Lovestoneites fought an international conflict with the Kremlin for control of Communism, and for immediate armed overthrow, not only of the American Government, but of all other governments founded on the principle of the constitutional-parliamentary system. The Lovestoneites wanted immediate destruction of all vestiges of national patriotism and the establishment of socialist federation governed by the philosophy of Karl Marx.

If there be among us any who have any doubts as to what would happen to our religious, political, and labor institutions, as well as countless other American traditions, I refer them to the manifesto of the left-wing revolutionary Socialists, which Wolfe, as a council member of that group, helped draft in 1919. This was the organization which collaborated with Lenin in 1919 to create the Communist International and the first American Communist Party. The story of the left-wing Socialists, their manifesto, and its offspring, the Communists, is presented in detail in the pamphlet *Organized Communism in the United States*, published in 1953 by the House Committee on Un-American Activities.

The record of Wolfe's key role in the revolutionary Socialist-Communist organizations, as well as documented evidence of Wolfe's 1929-to-1941 leadership in the Lovestone Communists, was brought to the attention of Mr. Theodore Streibert, Director of the International Information Agency, parent organization of the Voice of America.

Mr. Streibert's response, I am sorry to report, has been to turn heaven and earth to condone Wolfe's falsification of his civil-service application form, and to defend him as a loyal American engaged in a fight against international communism.

Mr. Chairman, what manner of reasoning have our Government leaders adopted, which pictures a man as a loyal American who, for at least 22 years, and right up to the time he was 45 years old, advocated and engaged in an international conspiracy to overthrow and destroy the very foundations of our Government?

This line of reasoning Mr. Streibert has followed in his defense of Wolfe, is a reflection, I think, of an information program which, for the past several years, has emphasized anticommunism without a clear realization of the fundamental alien Marxist philosophies which gave birth to communism. I think, too, that Mr. Streibert's reaction highlights the lack of understanding of, or lack of conviction in, the distinctive and revered features of the American system.

Even allowing for a possible renunciation of communism, which certainly is not evident in Bertram Wolfe's case, I cannot reconcile the appointment of such an admitted enemy of our American traditions to the key ideological policy post in the Voice of America.

To defend Wolfe's falsifications and to retain this alien philosopher in a position in which he has influenced the press, radio, and publication output of America's information and public relations, is beyond belief.

Perhaps a few persons in top positions in Government fear embarrassment over disclosure of their ignorance and negligence in employing Bertram Wolfe. But, Mr. Chairman, if we are going to destroy the Communist menace and weed out the persons who seek to overthrow and destroy the Government by armed violence, then we must start with persons, like Wolfe, who formulated the doctrine and put it into practice.

President Eisenhower came into the White House with a mandate from the people to clean up the mess in Washington. Certainly no man is more above reproach nor more sincere in his intention to preserve American heritages and to give us and the world a positive program based on those heritages.

Bertram Wolfe is the very symbol of the deep-rooted philosophies and personalities which the President inherited and which have defied his first year's efforts to unravel. Even men like Streibert, whom Eisenhower entrusted to the cleanup task, have succumbed to the insidious influence of the holdovers. Streibert failed to use the mandate given him by Congress in August to weed out Wolfe or the inestimable number of confederates and sympathizers in the agency.

From my study of the Wolfe case, I am convinced that there are countless numbers of disciples of Wolfe and the Lovestone Communists in Government today. They have not been touched by the many programs directed toward eradication of official Communist Party members from Government. In fact, the very emphasis on anti-Stalinism and

anti-"totalitarian" communism has provided the very avenue for their infiltration of Government, and non-Government organizations, by these Lovestone Communists. These original Communists—the Lovestoneites—were fighting Stalin and his diversion from the most radical International Revolutionary Socialist-Communist doctrine long before America's awakening to the menace of Stalin Russia.

But the Lovestoneites have been fighting Stalin and Stalin Russia as a political adversary in the world of communism, and not as an ally in the American ideological struggle against the overthrow and destruction of the Judo-Greco-Christian society's traditions.

Allow me now, Mr. Chairman, to highlight the philosophy and activities of the Lovestone Communists up to the time of their disbandment in 1941. It is a factual study assembled from writings of the Lovestoneites and contemporary works on international socialism-communism. Every thoughtful American, no matter what his religious or political or labor affiliation may be, should acquaint himself with the activities of this group; for it was from this group that bolshevism and communism were spawned, and it is this group which played a key role in the formation of foreign policies, which have neither defeated communism as a political-military-economic organization, nor obstructed the spread of communism-revolutionary socialism as an ideology.

Returning once again to a breakdown of the many millions of dollars requested by the United States Information Agency, I direct your attention to the fact that, despite recommendations by the President's own Committee of Inquiry, and by the Senate Subcommittee on Overseas Information Programs to the contrary, it is proposed that we spend \$970,000 in the next year for the maintenance of a newspaper in West Germany called the *Neuzeitung*. All experts who have surveyed the situation in Germany are agreed that this is a useless expenditure, in view of the existence of German anti-Communist newspapers which are finding their way behind the Iron Curtain. In short, we are proposing here to continue, and compound, an error of the past, namely, the continuation of the most extensive and most expensive information program in the world in Germany, where communism has never gained a foothold in the more than a century since Marx proposed his revolutionary theories in that country.

The personnel requirements are estimated at approximately 900 Americans and more than 5,000 indigenous personnel in Europe. On a world-wide basis, USIA presently has 255 posts located in 85 countries. I submit that the wise course of action, at this time, is to reduce the size of USIA substantially, thus giving authority to its director to rid himself of ineffectives, and to prove the ability of the agency to meet and defeat international communism in those areas where the agency now operates. Once they have demonstrated their ability, it would be possible for the Congress gradually to increase the amount of money

available to USIA, but only on a basis of proven performance. Such performance is not now satisfactory, and has not been in the past.

USIA, instead of implementing United States policy, is apparently setting itself up as another diplomatic service. On the record—and it is a record which they have submitted to this Congress in justification for the present budget request—USIA is becoming another State Department. They have asked for diplomatic passports. They are unable to reduce personnel requirements below 11,500 persons. No cognizance has been taken of the existence of other information services sponsored by private funds, such as Radio Free Europe, Radio Free Asia. No notice whatever is taken of the anti-Communist services of the other free governments, such as the British Empire, operating in the same areas. In Manila, for example—certainly the very heart of the free world in Asia, and with a magnificent record of the Philippines' fight against communism—we are presently operating a \$400,000 printing plant. We are asked to provide \$2½ million for a production center in Paris—primarily to produce films which could be produced cheaper and better right here—which would provide handouts for news centers which have their own news-gathering facilities and are staffed by enormous numbers of Americans who compound a situation of confusion that is already chaotic.

We have increased, in this budget, the amounts of money for other motion-picture productions to a total of nearly \$7 million. This, despite the availability of pro-American motion pictures, without cost to the Government, from private industry and from the motion-picture industry itself.

In the past 5 years, the American taxpayer has paid out one-half billion dollars for global-information programs and, in those 5 years, communism has won the battle on all propaganda fronts. USIA operates information centers throughout the world, which receive daily handouts prepared in the United States at one of the production centers which, if used at all, would be questionable, but which, by their disuse and misuse, are downright extravagance.

As another example, take the matter of travel in Germany. It is difficult to see how the 173 Americans, assigned to Public Affairs of the High Commissioner's office, could expend an estimated \$239,952 for travel. It is equally difficult to understand how 5 Americans and 669 Germans are required for the *Neuezeitung* newspaper, while only 1 American and 7 Germans are provided for the publication of what is supposed to be our principal cultural publication (the magazine *Der Monat*); not even why 13 Americans and 622 Germans are required for the operation of radio programs in Germany. In its continued justification for this enormous budget, USIA claims, "especially in the film, pamphlet, and library fields, are aimed at the refugee camps in West Germany, breeding places for malcontents and socially and economically unstable elements." I am glad to see this, because it was reported by

congressional committees a year ago that, in these refugee camps, no effort was being made by the United States Government to indoctrinate and orientate refugees. However, I question whether United States personnel and money can do a better job among these refugees than the vigorous West Germans themselves, who have integrated the one-half million refugees in their economy in the past year. This seems to me to be the most effective anti-Communist propaganda effort.

Mr. Chairman, I could take the rest of my time here today to invite the attention of my colleagues in the House to case after case in the proposed budget even more glaring than those which I have cited today. It should not be necessary for me to do this, and it would not be necessary had this budget been carefully examined by the director of USIA himself. I feel sure that had he done so and not accepted the estimates of the Truman-Acheson appointed subordinates in his office, he himself, would have arrived at a figure at least 30 percent under that which he proposed. I say again that if the caliber of personnel in USIA were commensurate with the amount of funds for which they asked, and if the work of USIA reflected true value for each tax dollar so carelessly allocated, no Member of the Congress would fail to give his wholehearted support to such requests. The fact that we do not have an effective overseas program is demonstrated by the success of the Soviet international propaganda effort in the Far East, in Italy, and in the satellite countries of western Europe. It is not enough merely to irritate the Communist conspiracy in our approach to the program of international information; it is not enough to devote millions of dollars to this effort. What is needed is a program and a policy directly implementing United States policies, and loyal to the present administration and its aims and purposes abroad. In the International Press Service—a key agency with many high-ranking and high-salaried employees—12 of the 14 branch chiefs and assistants are nonveteran holdovers of the old Office of War Information. It should be self-evident that examples like these are of themselves enough to make us pause in approving this budget. There are presently 973 employees in the Voice of America in New York City. It must be assumed that most of these fall into the category which I have just described. How can we possibly expect these people without experience in information media—other than the OWI—to carry out the present policy of this Government? How can we expect these people, reared in an era of boondoggling and give-away foreign-aid programs to prepare a budget aimed at the effective reduction of costs? Last, but most important, how can we expect these people, with their left-wing slant (and left-wing appointed), effectively to oppose international communism? The answer is self-evident, and it lies in a here-and-now reduction of taxpayers' dollars to a point where those people who line up on March 15th to pay for this international effort have some assurance that their

dollars are indeed to protect and further the interests of the United States.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BUSBEY].

Mr. Chairman, sometimes I think we are unable to see the forest for the trees.

We are in a cold war, a new type of war, but it is no less venomous, no less deadly, than a shooting war. We have been in that cold war for 7 years and there is nothing to indicate we are approaching the end.

In this war, propaganda has been one of the principal weapons used. It is one of the principal weapons available. I do not have to tell any Member of this House that the Communists have used propaganda to great advantage. They have used it with such telling effect that a great many of the so-called neutral peoples of the world today do not know whether we are right or whether the Reds are right.

You can never have a better commentary on the effectiveness of propaganda than that. We know who is right but our propaganda has not convinced others. Now it is proposed that we, to all effects and purposes, abandon our propaganda efforts, close down shop, and abandon any effective efforts to tell our story to the world. That is what this amendment would do.

Look around a little; make some inquiry; try to find out just what has been done by the information services before you take such a foolish step. You will find when you do that the information services are among our main defenses today. They are America's counterweapons to the Red propaganda that has been used with such telling effect during these past 7 years that we have been engaged in a cold war.

Of course, we do not agree with all the things the information services have done. They have done some foolish things. But I do not believe in shooting a horse just because he stumbles once or twice. We still can get a lot of work out of that horse. We still need him. We need the information services. We need them on a much bigger scale than they can operate under this bill that is before us now.

The facts are that the Reds are spending many dollars for every dollar that we spend in propaganda, yet ours has been very effective. The information services are doing a lot of good. I have seen their work; I have seen some of the effects of it.

Last fall, I was privileged to participate in an inspection trip of several different Government installations in Western Europe as a member of the Appropriations Committee. In the course of this trip, I observed a number of the operations of the United States Information Agency and the effect on these operations of the deep cuts made last summer in the appropriations for the overseas information program.

There is no question these contractions worked serious hardship on some of the Agency's operations. For example, the reduction in funds caused the elimination of some essential personnel, forcing the Agency to adopt an un-

economic level of operations in some phases of its work.

Therefore, from my own observations, I would say that the increased funds being requested by the President are necessary if the Agency is to operate at a minimum reasonable level of operations. In no sense can this be labeled a request for an expanded program.

Critics will ask, of course, can we appropriate the funds requested with the confidence that they will be spent effectively? From personal observation, again, I would say, yes, emphatically.

I have found it interesting, for example, to observe the contrast between the effectiveness of American and Soviet information activities in Austria. In Vienna, the Soviets have a very elaborate information center on which they spend an estimated \$25 million annually. This is many times the amount the United States has to spend on its center in Vienna. Yet, by actual count, the Reds have an average of 400 visitors to their information center daily, in contrast to our average of 3,000.

And on visits to both these centers, I was amazed at the enthusiastic quest for information at the American center, contrasted with the indifference of groups who wander in and out of the Soviet center.

Another operation which impressed me was the Voice of America's radio center at Munich, Germany. This center originates programs and also relays VOA short-wave broadcasts coming from the United States. It has a key role in that part of our whole broadcasting effort aimed at the captive peoples behind the iron curtain.

The Munich center is a good example of the important recent trend in our world-wide radio operations toward locally broadcast programs. In these radio operations, we are relying less and less on long-distance short-wave broadcasts which are relatively difficult to receive. Instead, we are placing more and more programs on local stations or networks abroad or broadcasting or relaying programs from stations of our own located close to the potential audience. In this way, we are able to reach many more people than by short-wave transmission alone.

The operations of the Munich center were recently strengthened by the addition of a powerful new million-watt transmitter, one of three placed in operation around the world by VOA last summer. These transmitters are the most powerful in the world. They help greatly to overcome Soviet jamming, and reach audiences that formerly were out of range.

The new Munich transmitter, interestingly enough, is on the same wavelength as the most powerful Soviet station in Moscow. Its operation has driven the output of this Soviet station back to about 200 miles from Moscow. As a result, if the Russians try to jam our incoming signal, they only succeed in jamming their own broadcasts in the area as well.

I was also very much impressed by the local broadcasting we are doing in Austria over the Red-White-Red network. The programs of this network are popu-

lar in Austria. It also helps meet the daily need for information of captive peoples behind the curtain.

Having observed our broadcasting operations at Munich and in Austria, I was particularly interested in an item which appeared recently in the press regarding the effectiveness of our broadcasts to some of the Iron Curtain countries.

An independent study has just been completed of the reactions of 110 young refugees to western radio programs. In this study, it was found that the most popular western station was the Voice of America. Second, was the British Broadcasting Corp., and, third, Radio Free Europe. These young refugees, interviewed over a year period, comprised 13 nationalities and had escaped from 8 different countries.

Thus, my confidence in our overseas information program derives partially from these recent personal observations of several of its operations.

I would not venture to suggest, however, that you support the President's request merely on the basis of these observations, for there have been important changes in the whole information program in the past several months which you must also take into account.

You will recall that the deep cuts made in the 1954 appropriation for this program were justified largely on the grounds that the program was badly in need of a thorough shakeup.

The past 6 months have brought such a shakeup. Substantial changes have been made in both the organization and methods of administration of the program:

All nonmilitary overseas information programs have now been consolidated in the new United States Information Agency.

The new Agency has been given a new mission and concept of operation by the President upon the advice of the National Security Council. This new mission stresses the interests and goals we share with other peoples. In carrying out this mission, emphasis is placed on objective, factual news reporting. Both the new mission and the emphasis on factual reporting have received considerable acclaim in the editorial pages of the American press.

Better coordination of our information programs with the other policies and actions of our Government has been achieved through the establishment of the Operations Coordinating Board—a unit of the National Security Council.

In its operations, the information program is now concentrating on fewer objectives in each country abroad. By this means, better use is being made of the resources available to the program.

A number of steps have been taken to achieve the decentralization of overseas operations called for by the Congress and other groups over the past several years.

The Director has also reported that the authority granted him by the Congress in the current fiscal year to remove incompetent employees in some categories has been used to improve the overall efficiency of the Agency. Likewise, according to the Director, all persons

deemed security risks have been removed.

Several new executives—many of them from private industry—have been brought into the top staff of the Agency.

Increased emphasis has been placed one bringing the skills and resources of private groups into our whole overseas information effort.

This is an impressive list of changes. These changes have gone a long way toward meeting the major criticisms which have been made against the program.

In this connection, I would like to commend to your attention the recent comments of two important groups which have been critical of the program in the past—the Hickenlooper committee and the United States Advisory Commission on Information, made up of a number of distinguished private citizens.

Appraising the first 6 months' operations of the new United States Information Agency, the Hickenlooper committee said this in its final report, dated February 1954:

There has been improvement in the operation of the information program during the past 6 months. . . . Many shortcomings remain and there is, as there always will be, room for improvement. It does appear, however, that a solid foundation for further progress has been laid. Many new policies have been initiated during the past 6 months and these should bear fruit as they take firmer hold and permeate the entire organization.

In a report also published this month, covering the same period of operations, the United States Advisory Commission on Information said this:

In our judgment the new agency is off to a good start. . . . While it is altogether too early to judge the results of its work, yet its efforts reflect an honest and intelligent effort to comply with the wishes of the new administration and of the 83d Congress for a bold, new type of program. For this effort we feel it deserves, for the time being at least, the sympathetic support of the executive and legislative branches of our Government, private industry, and the general public.

Considering these facts, I feel that even those who have been most severely critical of this program in the past can support with confidence the comparatively modest increase being requested by the President.

Certainly the amount being requested is not too great considering the magnitude of the problems we face overseas.

There is little question that these overseas information programs are essential to our national security. We cannot possibly do without them so long as Communist imperialism stalks the earth and continues to menace peace and freedom everywhere.

The menace from Communist propaganda is fully as great as from their armies.

The Communist imperialists have used propaganda as a tool of conquest with telling effect.

And they have succeeded in convincing millions of people in many parts of the world that we, the Americans, are bent on imperialist aggression.

Therefore, it is not enough in the world today for us merely to do the right thing. We must also convince others we are doing right—convince them that our actions help them achieve their legitimate goals and that we do not threaten them in any way.

And we must accomplish this difficult job of persuasion in the face of a Soviet propaganda machine which presses on relentlessly and tirelessly—sowing hatred, suspicion, and distrust—seeking to tear down everything we have sought to build, seeking to twist the face of a friend so it appears as the face of an aggressor.

This Soviet propaganda machine has enormous proportions. There is no way of getting an accurate estimate of how much the Soviet and its satellites spend on external propaganda. However, the most recent estimates are that on both internal and external propaganda the Soviet Union spent \$1,160,000,000 on direct propaganda activities in 1953. Communist China budgeted an even larger amount for propaganda in 1953—\$1,400,000,000. Certainly, it is obvious that on activities comparable to those conducted by the United States Information Agency the Communist nations are spending many times the \$89 million requested in the President's budget. I, for one, feel that compared with what these amounts must be, the funds requested by the President for the program of the United States Information Agency appear relatively insignificant.

Yet, if the cause of freedom is to triumph, we must succeed in thwarting the aims of this enormous Communist propaganda machine. Let us not overlook the fact that it is possible to lose the war against communism—even if not another shot is fired, not another bomb dropped, not another human being sacrificed in the agony of battle.

In summary, then, I have cited four major reasons why I believe that the Members of this distinguished body should support the comparatively modest increase in funds for the overseas information program requested by the President:

First. Considering the heavy cuts in the 1954 appropriation for the information program, the President's request in effect is not for a true increase, but merely for the restoration of a minimum reasonable level of appropriations.

Second. From my own personal observations of certain USIA operations, I am convinced that the overseas information program by and large is an effective operation meriting the support of this Congress.

Third. Important changes have been made in the program during the past several months which have met nearly all of the criticisms made in the past. Therefore, I believe that even those who have been most critical of the program in the past can now support the President's request with confidence.

Fourth. The global problems we face, and the enormous propaganda machine of the Communists, demand from us an adequate overseas information effort.

Therefore, we must demonstrate that we can face the facts. If we are to win the struggle being waged today for the

minds of men, we must be sure we provide the tools they need to those who fight our battles. We are getting results. We must have these results. It would be a serious mistake to make the cut that is proposed here.

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SIKES. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. BUSBEY. I agree with the gentleman that it is a very important branch of our psychological warfare, but the personnel that has been held over from the prior administration is still there. It is not effective any more. I think the thing to be done is to cut the whole agency by 75 percent of personnel and build it up with the right kind of personnel and give them twice as much money.

Mr. SIKES. Is the gentleman aggrieved simply because his party has not been able to fire everybody acquired from the previous administration? Is that the gentleman's only quarrel with the program?

Mr. BUSBEY. No. It is the caliber of personnel acquired.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, the pending proposed action of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BUSBEY], would not only be foolish, but dangerous; dangerous at a time when international tensions are what they are, when we are spending as much as we are for arms and defense against communism all over the world, and at a time when the Soviet Union is spending sums far in excess of this for their vicious untruthful propaganda activities. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BUSBEY] is not a member of this subcommittee. Consequently, he did not attend the hearings and listen to the agency's justifications. We know of his record as a hunter of known Communists. He mentioned one here on the floor who Mr. TABER says is no longer connected with the agency.

No Member of this House has been more vigorous in his efforts to have Communists and people who are real security risks summarily thrown out of the Government than the present speaker, the gentleman from New York.

Adoption of the pending amendment would utterly devastate this vitally important program. I have been, I think, as critical of the operation of this program over the years as any Member of the House. Members will recall that one time this agency presented to the subcommittee a supplemental request for \$97.5 million, and the committee unanimously, and the House agreed with us, cut \$90 million out of that request. At that time I was the chairman.

I want the best information agency we can get. I do not believe in their going into frills and activities which are not directed against communism and the Iron Curtain. I do not believe that they should spend a couple of hundred thousand dollars of the taxpayers' money to tell the American public how good they are. That was proposed in this budget, but the committee unanimously cut it out. Why, they are busy down there day after day getting out press releases, telling about this new person added to the

agency and the transfer of this other one. We could save many dollars in stencils and mimeograph paper by discontinuing such nonsense. The time and effort to compose these releases should be directed toward piercing the Iron Curtain. But because I disagree with this activity is no reason to utterly cripple a vital program.

The committee has already taken substantial action in regard to this agency's request when they cut some \$13 million from the amount of the budget estimate. To now reduce the amount further by \$20 million, as the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BUSBEY] proposes, would be utterly dangerous and unwarranted. I trust the pending amendment will be rejected.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois; one of the few times that I think I have ever opposed an amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois. We generally are in accord.

Mr. Chairman, I should like to say now that I am not familiar with the particular case that the gentleman from Illinois has discussed. However, I am seriously concerned with the cut that he has suggested.

As the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY] has said, I have been one of the severe critics of the United States Information Agency and in the past have taken the floor to support substantial cuts, to remove what we felt were unnecessary activities in this agency. But to further cut this program at this time would be taking away from this administration the opportunity to have a proper information service throughout the world.

I wish each Member of the House could have heard the presentation made to our committee by the new Director of the United States Information Service, Mr. Streibert. I am sure that everyone here would have been impressed, as were the members of our committee, that here we had a man to head up this organization qualified to do it from experience in the past in private industry. Mr. Streibert was before the committee for 4 days. Here is a man, the head of a new agency, who was able to come in and present himself practically all the testimony before our committee. He has shown himself well advised as to what was going on.

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOW. I yield for a question.

Mr. BUSBEY. I am not disputing the fact that Mr. Streibert is a radio man from the mechanical standpoint, but will the gentleman enlighten the Members as to what qualifications or experience he has had in dealing with the subject of communism? The only reason for spending all this money is to stop and contain communism.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Streibert has had experience in the radio field, the information field, and in administration. You can get any number of people who are investigators of communism, you can get writers who can write, but in

this agency in the past the trouble has been that we have had people who were not familiar with administration, how to run an agency, who were not familiar with the operation of large radio operations. The gentleman has seen the waste, and so have I.

The President himself has taken an interest in the United States Information Service by his reorganization plan. We have gone under the President's request with the bill we have brought to you. We think we have taken out some matters that should not have been in, of which the gentleman from New York spoke, such as propagandizing in this country. If we are going in this cold war to meet the Communist threat to the world, we cannot cut this program any further than it has been cut. I will say to the House as I did a year ago, when this agency begins to supply the kind of information service I know the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY] wants and the gentleman from New York [Mr. COUDERT] and the Members of this House, I for one will vote to increase these appropriations as they make their proof.

Mr. COUDERT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOW. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. COUDERT. I take this opportunity to congratulate the gentleman on his fine statement and to express my agreement with it and my opposition to this amendment. I happen to have known Mr. Streibert for a good many years. He is a gentleman of the highest character, great ability, and broad experience. If anybody can carry this agency to a successful conclusion he is the man.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOW. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. ROONEY. I thoroughly agree with what has been said here in opposition to the pending amendment by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Bow] and the gentleman from New York [Mr. COUDERT]. I believe Mr. Streibert is a highly intelligent, capable gentleman trying to do a good job. I disagree with the remarks of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BUSBEY] with regard to him. I do not know how many times the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BUSBEY] has met him, but he appeared before this committee for 4 or 5 full days, from early in the morning until late in the evening, and every member of the committee had a chance to observe the sort of gentleman he is.

Mr. BOW. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Bow] has expired.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may have 1 additional minute.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, I refer the attention of the gentleman to page

385 of the hearings where the gentleman himself [Mr. Bow] stated:

So that I may be sure I am right on this, the office which Mr. Washburn fills is new to the Service; Mr. Dickey is new, Mr. Withrow, Mr. Smith, Mr. Logan, Mr. Cook, and Mr. Berding, are all new?

Is the gentleman bringing out the fact that the new top executives in this agency are all new people and are not continuations of old personnel?

Mr. BOW. That is correct.

Mr. YATES. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOW. I yield.

Mr. BUSBEY. I hope the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. YATES] will read my extension of remarks in the RECORD about the replacement of personnel, and then he will be convinced that less of the old personnel have been replaced in this agency than in any other agency of the Government.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I support the amount which the committee is allowing for this particular type of work. I think our efforts to get behind the Iron Curtain are excellent, and while they are getting results, I think we ought to support these efforts and support them very enthusiastically. There is one part of the program, however, which does not meet my approval. I think it is wrong. I have taken this matter up with the State Department. Thus far, I have gotten rather meager results. I refer to the arrangements which we have in many instances to permit foreign legations in the United States to propagandize our people in return for which we hope to get a peek at what is going on behind the Iron Curtain. I think that this arrangement to let these people use our facilities for communism is all wrong. For instance, up until last December, I believe it was, we allowed the Rumanian Legation to publicize what was called the Rumanian News, a propaganda magazine, in the United States. These people had the right under a reciprocal arrangement to release as many copies of this publication and as often as they wanted to, as I understand it, throughout the United States to propagandize our people. It was pure and simple communistic propaganda given to our people for the purpose of converting them to the cause of communism. I am glad to say that the Department of State, when this matter was called to its attention, acted quickly and stopped this publication. I understood then that the Rumanian News was the last publication of that sort which was being permitted to be circulated in the United States. I rather breathed a sigh of relief and thought, "Well, this thing is all over." The other day, however, Mr. Chairman, I was given a copy of a booklet that is called the New Hungary.

New Hungary is a publication printed by the Legation here in Washington from the Iron Curtain country of Hungary. It is spread throughout the United States by use of our mail. It is

being mailed out to my district in Louisiana. It is being mailed out to your districts. It is being mailed largely to libraries and organizations. I think that it is a reprehensible situation that allows these Iron Curtain countries to publicize their Communist propaganda and to use our United States mails, to carry at less than cost this propaganda. Therefore, we are subsidizing the distribution of this publication and permitting it to be sent to our people to read so that they may be converted, if they are so deluded and misguided and benighted as to become Communists. Then, Mr. Chairman, we set up three great committees in the Congress of the United States. Do I have to name them? Everybody knows the names of these three great committees. We have a committee in the House of Representatives. I am proud of the fact that I voted to organize that committee originally when it was created. We have these committees set up here for the purpose of running down those people who believe in communism. We have, on the other hand, an arrangement under which we agree to carry Iron Curtain communistic propaganda publications printed and edited by the legations here in Washington and send it throughout the country for the express objective of creating communism in our land. I do not think anybody can exactly harmonize that situation. You cannot say in one breath that we want to locate these people who fight our Government, and we want to turn the searchlight of publicity on them, and that we want to put them into jail and yet at the same time we subsidize the carrying of their publications throughout the United States of America.

I am against this arrangement just as violently as a man can be against communism. I think it should be stopped, and I so told the State Department, and I have letters in my office defending this program, from the State Department—not from the leftover members in the State Department, but the Assistant Secretary of State who is there at this hour, functioning, defending that type of practice.

I do not think any Member of the House of Representatives is going to defend that type of practice of permitting those people to communize the people of the United States by using our mails as a subsidy for their propaganda.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BROOKS] has expired.

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I will not take the entire 5 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I want to say that while I agree with what I think is the major sentiment of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BUSBEY], namely, that the VOA program should be hard hitting and anti-Communist, I regret to say that I disagree with the gentleman's amendment to cut the appropriation. I think the program is becoming more anti-Communist, and getting away from the neutral position in which it has been. Undoubtedly, there is room for improvement. But the top men of the VOA are

good and dedicated men, and they mean to formulate a program to oppose the vicious lies of the Communists. If we are going to oppose the Communist line, we must have an effective anti-Communist line. Some people disdain the term "anti-Communist." But communism is essentially evil. One cannot disdain being "antievil."

I have had the privilege of associating myself with the gentleman from Illinois in hearings before our special committee to investigate the Soviet seizure of the Baltics and he and others have brought out some hard-hitting anti-Communist facts. These hearings have been used over the Voice of America, and at least 14 times Red radios from Moscow and elsewhere behind the Iron Curtain have hit back at us, indicating that we are drawing some blood. The Voice of America has cooperated with us very well, having beamed our hearing each day. The proof that the VOA has been effective with our hearings is the vicious Communist counterattack.

One further thing I would like to point out is some of the printed type of Soviet propaganda that we must hit at. I have in my hand a Soviet textbook for school-children printed in Moscow to be used in the captive nations, to educate the children of the captive nations. Here is a little pamphlet to the same effect. This textbook is designed to educate the children in the captive nations along the Communist line. This literature is spread into the captive nations by the millions and we must counteract it with literature of the free world. Otherwise, the new generation growing up in the captive nations will be fanatical Communists anxious to fight the West.

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. BUSBEY. I wish to assure the gentleman from Wisconsin I do not want to destroy anything in the information program that is doing a good job. I want to strengthen that. I just want to get rid of the other part of the program that is not doing as good a job as some people around the country think they are doing. If they are given a little cut we might get rid of some of those people and be able to hire some people who are better qualified to make the program more effective. I am not against the program.

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. I am happy to have the gentleman's statement that he is not against the program.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. ROONEY. It seems that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BUSBEY] wants to strengthen the activity by cutting it to the extent of \$20 million. It reminds me of the way President Eisenhower strengthened the Air Force; he took \$5 billion away from them.

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. I will say to the gentleman from New York, I would rather have no program than a bad program or a neutral program. I think we should have a hard-hitting,

anti-Communist program. I think we are moving in that direction, and the faster we do it the better.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BOW. Will the gentleman agree that the agency which the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. Brooks] was talking about a few minutes ago, when he was referring to the State Department USIS, now is separated from that agency, and is not the one he was referring to?

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. I so understood. I did not think it referred to the Voice of America in any respect whatsoever.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. JAVITS] be permitted to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Chairman, as one Member I must vigorously protest the sharp cut made in the appropriation for the United States Information Agency, over \$13 million under the budget estimate. At a time when it is estimated that the Communists are spending the equivalent of \$1,500,000,000 in this very field and when we are locked in a mortal struggle with them in Europe, Asia, and the Americas it seems inconceivable that we would not go all out in our own education and information program. All the arguments which have heretofore been made against this agency have now been answered. It has a directive from no less than the National Security Council, it is magnificently staffed, it has trimmed its employees by one-third, its scripts and presentation are hard hitting, factual and direct. Now that the agency has been reorganized and consolidated, answering all the complaints of before, we must back it in a full program. This is an essential third of the fight against communism, the other two parts being military and economic. To say that the amount granted is the same as last year is not an answer because last year the program was in reorganization and was still being held down as a changeover from the previous administration and in view of a major move from New York to Washington and other factors. I recognize the situation before the House and shall do all I can to get this amount materially increased in the other body and in conference.

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. Chairman, there is no question in my mind but what the Voice of America today is a very much better instrument than it was a year ago, 2 years ago, or 3 years ago. I think, however, that we still overestimate its value. I was talking to a refugee from behind the Iron Curtain just a short time ago, and I asked him about the effectiveness of the Voice of America behind the Iron Curtain. He said: "You know, those of us who do listen to it cannot help but get smiles on our faces when we hear the

Americans talk about how bad communism is, because we have it, we live under it, we know how dastardly it is, we are slaves of it; and it is rather ironical to have a country like America tell us how bad it is." Still I feel that the Voice of America should carry on, but I think that it will be ineffective and it will fail in its purpose if we do not implement what we hope to carry out by the Voice of America.

What we intend to do by the Voice of America is to discourage those people behind the Iron Curtain from accepting the doctrine of communism, to run away from communism, desert if they possibly can; and they are not deserting necessarily because they listen to the Voice of America but because they despise communism; and they are deserting by the hundreds every day. The point I am making is that when they carry out our suggestion and desert communism and come over to our side there is no provision or security for them. I would like to give you the story of three young men who were fliers, crack fliers, expert fliers in their respective countries dominated by the Communists. They came over to the United States of America at our suggestion hoping that they could join the United States Air Force and help fight godless communism throughout the world. When they came over to America they were interrogated for hours and weeks and months, and when the various agencies of our Government got all the information from them they could they were cast out into the street. In other words they could not become members of the United States Air Force or any air force for that matter to fight for their homeland.

I think there are two agencies of our Government that should work hand in hand: No. 1, the Voice of America should be continued, but we should implement the Voice of America and do something and carry through when these people follow our suggestion and desert. I would like to say in that respect that when we passed the mutual security bill some time ago, I think it was about 3 years ago, this Congress in its wisdom provided \$100 million which is already appropriated, to take care of these people who desert from behind the Iron Curtain and give them an opportunity to do something respectable, to fight back for their homelands.

Much to my regret, not one dime of that \$100 million that this Congress in its wisdom and far in advance of those in charge of our security has been spent. This Congress provided \$100 million to take care of those people who came from behind the Iron Curtain, but not a dollar of that money has been used for that purpose.

I say to you, Mr. Chairman, that this spending of \$78 million or \$79 million for the Voice of America asking these people to desert and come over to our side—and they are doing it in droves—will do no good unless we also get these people in charge of our security and our defense to use the \$100 million that this Congress in its wisdom provided to take care of those people so that they could take jobs, be responsible, and have jobs of responsibility, and, most of all, be given

the opportunity to fight back for their homeland. This thing is going to boom-erang because we are getting so many refugees now that they are beginning to ask questions. I might mention the Czech flier who escaped some months ago. He is now in the United States of America. After he has given all the information to the various agencies of our Government that he possibly could he has been refused entry into the United States Air Force and is now simply cast upon the streets, looking for a place to hang his hat. There are thousands of refugees in the same hopeless predicament. Those boys are going to begin to ask questions. They are going to begin to say: "Well, did we do the right thing? Over there we were fliers, we were lieutenants, and even if we were slaves, at least we had jobs, whereas here in the United States of America, where we hoped that we may get some opportunity to fight back for our homeland, that opportunity is denied us."

I say to you that unless we make provision for those people who escape as the result of our propaganda we should cut out the propaganda because, in my judgment, it is not right to ask people to expose themselves and then deny them an opportunity to fight for their homeland.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, those of us who know the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BUSBEY] realize that he is just as heartily in favor of this program as anyone can be. All he is trying to do is to call to the attention of the House and to some of those who have been trying to carry it on is to suggest that we get more competent individuals to handle it. That when an individual has been shown to be a Red or perhaps if he is just pink, he be removed from the service so a better, more competent man may take over.

In the last few days we have seen plenty in the papers about a statement which came from the President, suggesting that while he as much as anyone would fight communism as vigorously as anyone no matter where it cropped up, he wanted witnesses in congressional hearings treated courteously. We had a statement from a Member of the other body, whose home is in Wisconsin, in reference to how we should go about exposing communism and Communists. He insists that he treats witnesses fairly, though he may have made a mistake a few days ago. Of course, while some of us think that the gentleman from Wisconsin may have been a little hasty in expressing his opinion the other day—we all know the bitter opposition to his actions, since he is doing a worthwhile job which no one else seemed as capable of doing—we know the Army was absolutely wrong in following the course which it did with reference to the individual the gentleman from Wisconsin was talking about. The President so states.

To show that the Army like some of the rest of us can be off on the wrong foot, let me call your attention to this little book. And what happened to it. Here it is. It is John Roy Carlson's

Under Cover. Now that was put out in 1943 and it names and charges 41 Members of the House as well as 20 Members of the Senate with subversive activities. There were 4 Members of the House from Michigan named in the group.

What does it do? What was its purpose? Well, it just tries to tell the people of the country that there were subversives among Members of the House, naming them. It was a deliberate lying attempt to destroy politically, to liquidate, if you please, conservative Members of Congress. Let me give you a sample of the logic of John Roy Carlson.

Let me quote from page 200 about one Member of the House. He said there were four from Michigan. Here is an example. This is what he wrote about Mr. DONDERO, the gentleman from Detroit. If there ever was a man in the House who was and is after Communists all the time it is and was the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DONDERO]. No more able, patriotic Member ever came to Congress. What did Carlson and his gang have against him? Why did they cite him as subversive? Referring to a certain published article here is what Carlson—and that is but one of the several aliases he used—Carlson wrote:

And one by Congressman GEORGE A. DONDERO, is titled "United States Never Was a Democracy."

Most people know it is not—we know that it is a representative republic.

What do you know about that? The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DONDERO] said that this was a republican form of government, as did Benjamin Franklin, yet he is cited by this author as being subversive and his accurate description of our form of government is the proof. What nonsense.

Who put it out? Who gave circulation to this book with its vile, evil, false charges? This is what I am getting at and this is the point I am trying to make. The Army bought copies of the book with its false charges and gave copies to men in the service.

I wrote The Adjutant General on September 14, 1943, and I asked him how many of these books were purchased by the Army with tax dollars and sent out by the Army and whether there was any truth to the report made by a nationally known commentator that 5,000 had been purchased and distributed to forces overseas. He said there was not any truth to that.

But here is what he also wrote me:

This is in further reply to your letter of September 14, 1943, inquiring as to the accuracy of the allegation that the Army has purchased 5,000 copies of the book, Under Cover, for distribution to our soldiers.

Reports from the field just now available to me reveal that, in response to requests emanating from among some 5,500,000 soldiers, a total of 363 copies of this book has been purchased for post libraries from appropriated and nonappropriated funds, and that 107 additional copies are on order.

That was a total of 470 copies of this lying book carrying false charges of a lack of loyalty of 61 Members of Congress that the Army as early as 1943 was buying and making available to the servicemen—false charges which it was

thought might make the fighting men think they were not being supported by the folks at home.

Why did the Army do it? The Army did not do it. It was the act of some—to be charitable—nitwit who wanted to stir up trouble.

Let me read you what Judge Barnes said in Chicago when the house that published Under Cover was sued for libel:

The charges in the book—in the first place, the book is over 500 pages of twaddle—just twaddle, with a few outrageous charges—wholly unfounded charges, of which any citizen—any loyal citizen may very properly complain.

And they charge—I think they charge plaintiff—this book charges the plaintiff with being disloyal, being a Nazi agent, being an enemy of the United States, and being anti-Semitic. And I didn't hear any evidence of the truth of those charges. It wasn't attempted to show that he was a Nazi agent. It wasn't attempted to show that he was an enemy of the country. It was attempted to show that he was anti-Semitic. I didn't see any evidence of that fact.

I think that book was written by a wholly irresponsible person who was willing to say anything for money. I wouldn't believe him on oath, now or at any time hereafter.

I think that book was published by a publisher who was willing to publish anything for money. That is what I think about it. I don't think they made any adequate investigation of the author of that book. If they had they would not publish it unless they cared more for the almighty dollar than they care for human decency. That is the way I feel about it.

And, John Roy Carlson last week was lecturing in Detroit still going around peddling his poison. My point is that we better hunt Communists and communism wherever we find them, even though they may be in the Republican Party. Certainly no executive department—should be a "city of refuge" for either—The President so says and our Wisconsin friend intends—if I understand him—intends to hunt them out—maybe he was a little rough the other day, but, would our leftwing Communists complain so long as they do not want the job, unless of course they prefer they remain hidden.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BUSBEY].

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be reread.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

(The Clerk again read the amendment.)

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BUSBEY].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. RABAUT: At page 52, after line 19, add the following new section:

"SEC. 604. No part of any appropriation contained in this act shall be used to pay the salary or wages of any officer or employee of the Bureau of Security and Consular Affairs

of the Department of State who, for the purposes of the act of August 2, 1939, as amended (5 U. S. C. 1181), shall not be included within the construction of the term "officer" or "employee."

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order against the amendment that it is legislation on an appropriation bill; that it changes existing law and requires new and additional duties.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Michigan desire to be heard?

Mr. RABAUT. Yes, Mr. Chairman. I cite volume VII, Cannon's Precedents, section 1663 and section 1670:

1. Denial of use of an appropriation for payment of salaries of employees of the Department of Agriculture who forecast the price of agricultural products was construed as a proper limitation and in order on an appropriation bill.

The Chairman at that time, March 2, 1928, Allen T. Treadway, of Massachusetts, relied on prior decisions of Chairmen of the Committee of the Whole, Mr. Graham, of Illinois, in 1924, and Mr. Longworth, of Ohio, in 1923, and held such a limitation proper and not subject to point of order.

2. An amendment forbidding payment of salary authorized by law from any part of an appropriation to a designated individual was held to be a limitation and in order on an appropriation bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from New York desire to be heard?

Mr. TABER. I do, Mr. Chairman.

This amendment, Mr. Chairman, refers to the so-called Hatch Act, section 1181, of title V of the Code. It reads as follows:

For the purposes of this section the term "officer" or "employee" shall not be construed to include (1) the President and Vice President of the United States; (2) persons whose compensation is paid from the appropriation for the Office of the President; (3) heads and assistant heads of executive departments; (4) officers who are appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, and who determine policies to be pursued by the United States in its relations with foreign powers or in the nationwide administration of Federal laws. The provisions of the second sentence of this subsection shall not apply to the employees of the Alaska Railroad.

This provision in effect brings about the prohibition of payments to these employees who are not determined to be officers or employees within the provisions of this paragraph of section 118. It requires a determination on the part of some officer before the thing can be effective. For that reason, it requires additional duties to be performed by some officer before it can be effective. Therefore, it is subject to the rule that it requires additional duties, and it is an attempt on the part of the amendment to change and enlarge the provisions of that section.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Michigan desire to be heard further?

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, in House Report No. 1365, 82d Congress, relative to H. R. 5678, the McCarran-Walter bill, it is stated on page 36:

The Bureau of Security and Consular Affairs, section 104, creates a new organizational setup within the Department of State to administer the issuance of passports and visas. There will be a responsible authority

in the Department of State of rank and power corresponding to the Commissioner of Immigration and Naturalization and to the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation—

Mr. J. Edgar Hoover—
and the Central Intelligence Agency—

Mr. Dulles—
all of whom are to collaborate in the interests of national security.

Is it the contention of anybody here that we would want, for instance, Mr. J. Edgar Hoover going around the country making political speeches?

The CHAIRMAN. That is just an observation. It does not go to the point of order.

Mr. RABAUT. I know; but I have raised the point of order, Mr. Chairman, and I would like a ruling from the Chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is prepared to rule.

This amendment in brief provides that no part of any appropriation contained in this act shall be used to pay the salary or wages of any officer or employee of the Bureau of Security and Consular Affairs who shall not be included within the construction of the term "officer" or "employee."

It appears to the Chair that the contention of those who make the point of order is answered by this provision in Hinds' Precedents, volume IV, section 3954:

A provision that no part of an appropriation for pay of retired Army officers should go to one receiving pay for services as a civil employee was held to be a limitation.

Likewise we have a similar expression in Cannon's Precedents, volume VII, section 1651, which contains the provision that no part of an appropriation shall be allotted to a beneficiary failing to comply with certain requirements. That provision was held in order as a proper limitation on an appropriation bill. With those two precedents the Chair is constrained to overrule the point of order, and the Chair so rules.

The point of order is overruled.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, I am offering this amendment to make clear the intent of Congress when it established the Bureau of Security and Consular Affairs through the passage of H. R. 5678, the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1952, Public Law 414. There is nothing punitive about this amendment. It in no way refers to prior political activities of the individuals concerned. The State Department has vacillated in its reasoning, but steadily held the conclusion that the Director of the Bureau is not subject to the prohibition against political activity contained in the Hatch Act. The Civil Service Commission has at least informally indicated to the contrary. Such confusion about the nature of this important office should be cleared up. House Report 1365 of the 82d Congress on the bill H. R. 5678 described this authority in the Department of State as having rank and power corresponding to the Commissioner of Immigration and Naturalization and to the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation and the Central Intelligence Agency. I am sure no Member of the

House would deem it proper for FBI Director J. Edgar Hoover, or the CIA Director, Allen Dulles, to go charging about the country making political speeches in the manner of Mr. McLeod. My amendment makes it perfectly clear that Congress intended these two officials to be in the same category in this respect. Politics is not and should not be the province of these officers to whom we have entrusted the guardianship of the national security. For this reason I present my amendment and hope the House will support it.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RABAUT. I yield.

Mr. JUDD. May I ask if the gentleman made a speech similar to this when the former administrator of the ECA, Mr. Averell Harriman, went about the country making violently partisan political speeches?

Mr. RABAUT. Perhaps it was the prerogative of the gentleman from Minnesota to make a speech at that time.

Mr. JUDD. I would just like to know whether the gentleman from Michigan was as disturbed then about improper political activity by these officers, as he is now?

Mr. RABAUT. I said that I am not making a political football out of this. I will ask the gentleman, does he think it would be a proper thing if J. Edgar Hoover went running around the country making political speeches?

Mr. JUDD. No, I am talking about Averell Harriman.

Mr. RABAUT. That is not the point that I am making here.

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RABAUT. I yield.

Mr. PRICE. I think the gentleman might point out that Mr. McLeod and Mr. Averell Harriman did not hold similar positions.

Mr. JUDD. I beg the gentleman's pardon.

Mr. PRICE. There is no comparison in the positions.

Mr. JUDD. The position of Averell Harriman is a far more important position and he is sent around the world as the representative of the United States, and yet he made, for example, at Houston, Tex., a violently partisan attack.

Mr. PRICE. Mr. McLeod was a security officer in the Department of State. He was in charge of personnel. I think it would not be fitting in his job to participate in partisan politics.

Mr. JUDD. Do you think it was fitting that Mr. Harriman should do what he did?

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RABAUT. I yield.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. I would say to the gentleman your amendment does not limit the boy wonder from Minnesota from going around making speeches, the present ECA administrator who is making partisan speeches. He has the same job. This is an entirely different situation.

Mr. RABAUT. My amendment deals with security officers of the United States, and I do not think there is any-

body in the House of Representatives who ought to be opposed to it.

At this time I should like to read the Hatch Act provision—Title 5, United States Code, section 118i:

For the purposes of this section the term "officer" or "employee" shall not be construed to include (1) the President and Vice President of the United States; (2) persons whose compensation is paid from the appropriation for the office of the President; (3) heads and assistant heads of executive departments; (4) officers who are appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, and who determine policies to be pursued by the United States in its relations with foreign powers or in the nationwide administration of Federal laws.

This is a clear case. I hope the House will not ascribe a political purpose to this, but look at it from the angle from which it deserves to be looked at, and vote for the amendment.

Mr. COUDERT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

I do not think it need take very long to state the position of the committee on this amendment. I am pretty sure that every Member of the House understands the character of this amendment, the purpose of this amendment and what is back of it. It is nothing more nor less than another attempt, purely partisan attempt, by the gentlemen on the other side to discredit the State Department, presently under a Republican President and a Republican Secretary of State. There is nothing else to it than that.

Last year these gentlemen attacked and knocked out of a bill, this bill, a provision that they themselves had incorporated for the benefit of Democratic Secretaries of State, to-wit: the power to fire. As soon as we get a Republican President and a Republican Secretary of State, we get the ripper tactics to knock out the very provision that was put in for the benefit of Democratic Secretaries; but it is too good for a Republican Secretary.

Now we have this very curious situation here where there is a ruling as to a relatively minor official of the State Department by the responsible heads—presumably the Secretary himself—that this individual is not subject to the limitations of the Hatch Act. So here comes one of our Members, a Democratic Member, and seeks to reverse, by the action of this House, the administrative determination of that Secretary.

Mr. Chairman, are we going to undertake to manage the State Department, and on our side of the aisle are we going to permit the Democratic minority to manage the State Department while we are sitting in majority on this side? Oh, no, Mr. Chairman. This amendment must be knocked out. It is purely partisan. There is no purpose in it except to injure and discredit the State Department. There is no merit to it. It should be voted down.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I think the gentleman from New York [Mr. COUDERT] is completely misinterpreting the intent of this amendment. I am sure you will agree with that from his opening statement,

where he said that this is an attempt on the part of the Democrats to discredit the State Department under the present administration. All of the attempted discrediting of the State Department that I have noticed lately has not come from the Democrats. According to the press those people who made Dulles break down and tears come to his eyes during his report on the Berlin Conference were not Democrats. Now about the gentleman from Minnesota comparing this situation to Mr. Averell Harriman—and let me state right here that I am not a great admirer of Mr. Harriman, but the circumstances are not comparable, because Mr. Harriman was holding the position that Mr. Stassen now holds and I do not think there is anyone on this side of the House who wants to gag Mr. Stassen. He is in a position of Cabinet rank and he has a perfect right, as I see it, to go around making any kind of political speech he wants and to defend himself against attacks which are made against him not by Democrats, if you please, but by people who are supposed to be of the same political party that he is.

But the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan is aimed at doing what needs to be done, I do not care whether it is a Republican administration or a Democratic administration, security officers should be kept from engaging in politics, and I think it especially needs to be done, since it has been proved conclusively that some of them did not tell the truth, will not tell the truth, and do not know the truth when they see it.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. Chairman, it would have been much better if the gentleman from New York [Mr. COUDERT] had confined himself to the amendment and not extended his remarks to the full extent that he did. I am going to talk on the broader implications involved in the gentleman's remarks rather than discuss the amendment itself.

I happen to occupy a position of leadership in the Democratic Party. For 10 out of the last 13 years I was the majority leader of this House, and now I am the Democratic whip. I have attended many important conferences during the past year. I have seen no Democrat who criticized or embarrassed Secretary Dulles or President Eisenhower. We have discussed merits but never engaged in personalities.

I was present at the meeting that took place when Secretary Dulles returned from his hard ordeal in Berlin. I could visualize what he had gone through by asking myself: "JOHN McCORMACK, suppose you were Secretary of State; what would have been your thoughts? What would have been the ordeal you went through, knowing the situation of the world as it is today?"

There were no Democrats who criticized Secretary Dulles, I am informing the gentleman from New York [Mr. COUDERT]—and I am not attributing his remarks to any other one of my Republican friends, I want that distinctly understood—this is the time to withhold

many words. There is the courage of action, but there is also the courage of silence. Sometimes it takes a lot of courage to be silent, and this is the time when we should stop, look, and listen, and ponder long before we make intemperate attacks upon either of the great political parties as such.

I have not seen any Democrat make any critical statement about Secretary Dulles in relation to the Berlin conference. I made a few guarded remarks yesterday, but no criticism. I felt that under the circumstances he did the best he could, not what he wanted to do, but under the circumstances he did the best he could so far as the Berlin conference is concerned; that he was faced with a probable blowup unless he agreed to the Geneva conference. I could see that. He had the situation in Indochina confronting him as well as other countries; and also the division of public opinion in other countries friendly to us, in some of which the Communist forces are very strong. I could see all of that. I did not necessarily have to agree with the Secretary to refrain from criticizing him and making his job more onerous.

So when the statement is made, and I assume it does not represent the Republican view, that the Democrats are trying to injure the State Department because of the offering of this amendment by the gentleman from Michigan, that statement is completely inconsistent with the facts.

Mr. COUDERT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. COUDERT. If the gentleman is so well satisfied with the Secretary of State—

Mr. McCORMACK. I did not say that, did I? Do not put into my mouth words I did not say.

Mr. COUDERT. Well, I was merely attempting to construe what the gentleman meant.

Mr. McCORMACK. I did not say I was satisfied with him. Do not put into my mouth words. The gentleman is raising another question he did not raise previously because the gentleman is trying to raise the question whether or not I am satisfied. I am not talking on the question of satisfaction or dissatisfaction. I specifically say I am not dissatisfied yet.

Mr. COUDERT. If the gentleman is not dissatisfied with the conduct of foreign affairs by the Secretary of State—

Mr. McCORMACK. I did not say that. I said I am not dissatisfied yet with the Secretary of State. The gentleman says "conduct of foreign affairs." Do not put into my mouth words I did not say. My friend from New York is very adroit, and the gentleman from Massachusetts may be lacking in mental ability, but the gentleman from Massachusetts is capable of understanding some things the gentleman from New York says; furthermore to a slight extent the gentleman from Massachusetts can penetrate his mind.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, and I am not going to object, I will say to the gentleman from Massachusetts, but we have been at this a considerable time and there are three other matters we want to dispose of. I am going to make a suggestion.

Mr. McCORMACK. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALLECK. I am not going to object.

Mr. McCORMACK. I withdraw my request, Mr. Chairman, because I have said all I intended to say and I think a prolongation of it would not be for the best interests of the situation because the gentleman from New York is trying to be, kindly and friendly to say the least, provocative.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on the pending amendment and all amendments thereto close in 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I have an amendment at the Clerk's desk.

Mr. TABER. Is it an amendment to the pending amendment?

Mr. ROONEY. Oh, no. It is another amendment.

Mr. TABER. I only asked unanimous consent with reference to this particular amendment.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object in order to make a statement, and I am certainly not going to object, I note at the desk there are 3 amendments. It occurred to me that after we have disposed of the pending amendment we could have a limitation of 30 minutes, which will give 5 minutes to a side on each of the amendments, then we can dispose of this matter.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, I want 5 minutes to ask certain questions in reference to the interpretation of some language in the bill.

Mr. HALLECK. Then it would have to be 35 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER]?

There was no objection.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I wonder just exactly what will be in the minds of the Members as they approach this vote. This is a proposed limitation on an appropriation bill which would prevent the payment of salary to the holder of a certain position who is legally in office.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. RABAUT. I do not think that is true.

Mr. TABER. I am sorry if the gentleman thinks so. I think he ought to read it.

Mr. RABAUT. The amendment simply says that he comes under the Hatch Act.

Mr. TABER. Well, if that is it, the point of order should have been sustained.

Mr. RABAUT. It was not sustained, and it is so.

Mr. TABER. If it is so, the gentleman is now admitting that his amendment is entirely out of order.

Mr. RABAUT. No; I am not admitting my amendment is entirely out of order.

Mr. TABER. Well, I do not see any other possible construction.

Mr. RABAUT. The only thing it does is stop him from making speeches. It lets him hold his position as a security officer.

Mr. TABER. Now, let me tell you what this does. This stops the payment of any wage or salary of any officer or employee of the Bureau of Security and Consular Affairs who, for the purpose of this act, shall not be included within the construction of the term "officer" or "employee." I do not know what else you call it. Anyway, by this kind of an amendment, if it prevails, you stop the payment of the salary out of this appropriation. Such an amendment, if it changed the Hatch Act, would be out of order, and it would not be proper. The officer who is legally installed could go to the Court of Claims and collect his salary. That is how good this amendment is. I do not believe that the House of Representatives wants to indulge in that kind of legislation. I hope that this amendment will be defeated. I believe also that the Secretary of State, having given a particular construction as to what the meaning of the language was as to this Department, should be sustained by the House.

Mr. MORANO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. MORANO. As a matter of fact, the amendment does not mean anything because if the Secretary of State again decided that this man was in a position that did not come under the Hatch Act, he could continue to work and draw his pay just the same.

Mr. TABER. Right.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. RABAUT].

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, on that I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. CLEVINGER and Mr. RABAUT.

The Committee divided; and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 61, noes 84.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that debate on this bill and all amendments thereto be limited to 35 minutes, that 5 minutes be allowed to the gentleman from Minnesota

[Mr. JUDD], and that 5-minute statements be allowed, 1 for and 1 against, on amendments that may be offered.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. JUDD].

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, I should like to address several questions to the chairman or other members of the subcommittee regarding certain things in the committee report. On page 19 of the report, in the long paragraph on the lower half of the page, there are 6 or 7 committee recommendations which appear to be intended as limitations, as I read them.

For example, down in the middle of the paragraph it is stated:

For the Office of Private Cooperation the committee recommends the same amount as was actually expended in fiscal year 1953, which was \$99,727.

Actually, the Office of Private Cooperation will have used by the end of the current 1954 fiscal year approximately \$182,000, and requested \$250,000 for 1955.

This office of the United States Information Agency carries on, I think, one of its most useful functions. It has been able, as Mr. Streibert explained on page 571 of the hearings, to get over 800 foundations, organizations, groups, and businesses to cooperate in telling our story abroad.

It seems to me that if the subcommittee wants to cut it down, it ought to write the limitation into the bill itself, and say that not more than \$99,000 shall be used for this particular office. Then we who believe the amount should be increased could offer an amendment to change that limitation. I do not know why the committee report carries a recommendation that only the amount used in 1953 be allowed, and not the amount used in 1954, which was almost doubled because the office had improved and properly expanded its activities and gotten a remarkable response from private agencies to do the job of telling America's story abroad. They can do it without the stigma and handicap of being Government propaganda.

What I would like to find out is, What is the force, legal and otherwise, of this irregular way of legislating? Are these recommendations binding upon the Administrator of this agency? Would there be reprisals against him by the subcommittee if he did not follow them because he felt that in order to carry out the main purposes of the agency, he had to deviate from the recommendations? Does the Administrator have his hands tied within his own agency by recommendations in a committee report?

Mr. CLEVINGER. It is a committee recommendation and the committee would expect weight to be given to its recommendations.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JUDD. I yield.

Mr. ROONEY. I cannot understand the distinguished chairman of the committee making a remark like that here

on the floor of the House after the committee was in full agreement on this. The language of the report is directive, not a recommendation. There was no objection to the action of the committee by anyone with regard to this. If I recall correctly, this is the matter in which they sought a very substantial increase in funds in order to have people traveling all over the country.

Mr. JUDD. I still would like to know: Is it your judgment then that this recommendation of the subcommittee is binding on the Administrator of the agency, and that he cannot exceed this figure?

Mr. ROONEY. It most certainly is.

Mr. JUDD. Then suppose the will of the House is not in accord with the will of the subcommittee and the House would like to change that recommendation? How can one offer an amendment to a committee report? You see the House is prevented by this subcommittee procedure from working its own will. If the limitations were in the bill itself, one could offer an amendment to change the figures on this item and others like "a total of \$40,000 is recommended for the Office of the General Counsel." Actually, we would save money by having all contracts reviewed by legal counsel. Many had mistakes that could have been prevented thereby. Why not let the Administrator correct this weakness by enlarging his legal staff budget to about \$70,000, as requested?

But the recommendation is in a committee report and I am helpless to do anything about it. If it is binding, it ought to be in the law and if it is not in the law, then it ought not to be considered binding, and that ought to be understood here and now.

Mr. CLEVENGER. May I point out to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. Judd] that in a representative government it is inherent that some of these powers would be delegated, and we do the best we can when we go into the committee room to find out what they are doing with the money and how judiciously they are spending it. That is one of the prices we have to pay for a representative government.

Mr. JUDD. I do not think that quite answers my question. I cannot see why, if the committee was in complete agreement on this and felt that there ought to be this limitation, you did not write it in the text of the bill. There are other such limitations in the bill.

Mr. CLEVENGER. We try to leave a little "give and take" in a bill, and not make it too restrictive.

Mr. JUDD. This ought to be spelled out definitely one way or the other because it does not seem to me that these committee reports ought to be considered binding, and yet we are unable to amend them.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. HAGEN of California. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HAGEN of California: On page 21, line 13, after "General", strike out "\$39,000,000" and insert "\$39,697,000."

Mr. HAGEN of California. Mr. Chairman, I am sure you are all familiar with the problem of wetbacks after the discussion we had the other day. One aspect of the wetback, so-called illegal Mexican problem, is the question of the proper appropriation for the border patrol and the Immigration and Naturalization Service. If we really are trying to solve the problem of illegal entrants, we have to provide the Service with sufficient money to be able to police the border and to pick up the illegal entrants once they get into this country. I am not on the Committee on Appropriations and, therefore, I am not too familiar with the budget, but I am hitting an aspect of the appropriation which is wholly clear. I read the committee report and I closely read the hearings on this particular subject. At page 183 of the report relating to the Justice Department, I find this statement by an officer of the Service, Mr. Habberton:

A cutback of \$697,000 is scheduled in items covering alien travel, contractual detention, hospitalization, and food for aliens. If the ratio between deportations overseas and those to adjacent countries remains about the same in 1955 as in the fiscal year 1953, this cutback should have no material detrimental effect upon activity looking to deportations to countries other than Mexico. However, it does mean that funds will not be available for airlift, trainlift, or buslift of Mexican aliens. Also, depending upon developments, the Service may be financially unable to accept custody of all aliens picked up by local law-enforcement officers in the lower California and Texas areas.

The fact is that the Service is grossly understaffed in this matter of enforcement of our immigration laws as they concern Mexican aliens.

I have in my hand a clipping from the Fresno Bee of February 24, which is as follows:

WETBACK ISSUE IN FRESNO COUNTY STIRS DISPUTE

FRESNO.—Fresno County supervisors angrily rejected a statement by the Immigration Service that it can make no additional efforts to drive out invading swarms of wetbacks.

And the county board resolved to appeal to its Congressmen for stronger control at the Nation's southern border so that Mexican nationals will be halted from coming in, rather than be rounded up after making good their entry.

Board Chairman Sidney Cruff had demanded of the Immigration and Naturalization Service that it send additional agents to clear out wetbacks because the Mexicans are replacing domestic farm labor and causing employment and relief burdens.

SITUATIONS ARE SIMILAR

Bruce G. Barber, head of the Service's San Francisco district, replied in a letter:

"We are continually receiving reports of situations similar to that existing in Fresno County, not only from law-enforcement agencies, welfare departments, and other public officials, but from individuals from many areas of the San Francisco district."

Barber said his office, which patrols all California counties north of Kern, as well as the States of Utah and Nevada, had asked its Washington, D. C., headquarters for additional help, but none could be supplied because of budget limitations.

The district director also said that no more border patrolmen could be dispatched to the Fresno area because that would work

hardships on other parts of northern California.

LIMITED JAIL FACILITIES

Barber said the Service's operations in the Fresno area were hampered by limited jail facilities, making it necessary to deport aliens by buses the same day they were arrested.

Cruff and other supervisors declared that if the border control were tightened, fewer officers would be needed in interior California.

And Cruff asserted Barber's remarks about the Fresno jail were completely false. Cruff claimed the local immigration officer, Leonard Adams, says the jail facilities do not hinder alien roundups.

The supervisors voted unanimously to raise the charge of the Government for housing Federal prisoners, such as wetbacks, from the present \$1.10 a day to a new rate of \$1.50 a day.

In reply to that the local head of the service said they just did not have the agents. The local law-enforcement agencies have to do a good part of this job of policing this problem of illegals crossing the border. They make the arrests, and they make temporary detentions, and unless you provide the where-withal for reimbursing the local agencies for boarding these people, they are not going to do it. I say to my Republican colleagues your reported concern with the wetback problem in discussing House Joint Resolution 355 will be revealed as sheer hypocrisy if you fail to vote for my amendment.

In one of my counties they had to build an extension on the jail to hold these alien Mexicans. If sufficient funds are not forthcoming to reimburse the local agencies of government for their part in this program, you are going to have the country overrun with illegal Mexican workers. It is not just a problem of putting the local people out of employment. We have never, until the advent of alien Mexican labor, in my part of the country, had a rural narcotic problem. Yet today you can pick up any paper, any day, and read of numerous arrests for the sale or use of narcotics. I understand that Mexico is the prime source of heroin in this country. It would be ridiculous to assume that these illegal Mexicans are not carrying the narcotics, and that we need to enforce our immigration and naturalization laws with respect to them.

Not only that, they bring a whole train of moral and criminal problems with them. Our jails are crowded with the results of their activities. All I am asking is the restoration to this budget of \$697,000, which will permit the counties to continue their participation in this program of rounding up and deporting these illegal entrants. Without this \$697,000 addition, the policing of wetbacks will be severely handicapped. To my Republican colleagues who have a wetback problem which they recognize I say you cannot, in good conscience, fail to give your local people the monetary assistance reflected in my amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California [Mr. HAGEN] has expired.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, on yesterday before the vote on the \$17 million Clevenger amendment the distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. HINSHAW] advised the House that the payments of subsidy moneys to the airlines are not something that the Committee on Appropriations is to decide. He said they are "in the law as an obligation upon the Congress to pay."

In this regard, I call the Members' attention to the following extract from opinion May 13, 1953, by James P. Radian, Jr., Chief, American Law Division, Library of Congress:

Under the proposed reorganization plan, would the Civil Aeronautics Board have authority to obligate the funds for subsidies without action directly by Congress?

If by "without action directly by Congress" you mean without previous authorization and appropriation, the answer is no. Article I, section 9, clause 7 of the United States Constitution provides: "No money shall be drawn from the Treasury, but in consequence of appropriations made by law." This clause is a restriction upon the disbursing authority of the executive department, and means simply that no money can be paid out of the Treasury unless it has been appropriated by an act of Congress. (*Cincinnati Soap Co. v. United States* (1937) 301 U. S. 308.) No officer, however high, not even the President, is empowered to pay debts of the United States generally, when presented to them. (*Reeside v. Walker* (1950) 11 How. 272.) There is, however, under the present law (which would be true under the proposed reorganization plan) no method of controlling the amount allocated for individual subsidies except to the extent that the totals must not exceed appropriations. Under the present law, the cost of air mail transportation service and the amount of subsidies are consolidated and the rate of compensation is fixed by the Civil Aeronautics Board which the Postmaster General is obligated to pay from the appropriations for air mail transportation services. Under the proposed reorganization plan it would appear necessary to limit payments from the appropriation for air mail transportation services payable by the Postmaster General to the amount fixed by the Civil Aeronautics Board as the rate of compensation for these services. The payment of subsidies under the proposed reorganization plan would be made by the Civil Aeronautics Board from appropriations made therefor. It is not possible under the Constitution for any public officer or department to obligate the United States to pay any moneys whatsoever except pursuant to statutory authorization.

It is for Congress, proceeding under the Constitution, to say what amount may be drawn from the Treasury in pursuance of an appropriation, and if an officer, upon his own responsibility, and without the authority of Congress, assumes to bind the Government, by express or implied, contract, to pay a sum in excess of that limited by Congress for the purposes of such a contract, the contract is nullity, so far as the Government is concerned, and no legal obligation arises upon its part to meet its provision. (*Hoe v. United States* (1910) 218 U. S. 322.)

From a practical point of view no air mail carrier or other air carrier would have a claim, other than moral, against the United States for any promised subsidies which had not been specifically authorized by statute and which had not been specifically allocated from funds previously appropriated. Con-

gress has power to recognize moral obligations. (*Marion & Eye Valley Railroad Co. v. United States* (1926) 270 U. S. 280.)

Mr. Chairman, I also wish to call attention in this regard to the following memorandum addressed to Hon. JOHN F. KENNEDY, of Massachusetts, under date May 19, 1953:

THE LIBRARY OF CONGRESS,
LEGISLATIVE REFERENCE SERVICE,
AMERICAN LAW DIVISION,
Washington, D. C., May 19, 1953.

To: Hon. JOHN F. KENNEDY.

(Attention: Mr. Marvin.)

Subject: Power of the Civil Aeronautics Board to obligate the United States for subsidy payments under the proposed reorganization plan and under S. 1360 of the 83d Congress.

Assuming, arguendo, that the proposed reorganization plan is valid, then the power of the Board to obligate the United States for subsidy payments would emanate from section 406 (b) of the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938 (52 Stat. 998; U. S. C. 49: 486). The pertinent part of this section, with respect to subsidies as distinguished from compensation for airmail transportation service after the effectuation of the division of the function under the proposed reorganization plan, would be: "and, [the need] together with all other revenue of the air carrier, to enable such air carrier under honest, economical, and efficient management, to maintain and continue the development of air transportation to the extent and of the character and quality required for the commerce of the United States, the postal service, and the national defense." The authority thus granted by section 406 (b) to consider the foregoing factor in the fixing of airmail transportation compensation is a rather nebulous basis upon which to predicate a reorganization plan under which an obligatory contract for the payment of subsidies may be made.

But even if it were sufficient authority to support obligatory contracts for the payment of subsidies, such contracts would be subject to the limitations of Revised Statutes 3678 (U. S. C. 31: 665), the first subsection of which reads: "No officer or employee of the United States shall make or authorize an expenditure from or create or authorize an obligation under any appropriation or fund in excess of the amount available therein; nor shall any such officer or employee involve the Government in any contract or other obligation, for the payment of money for any purpose, in advance of appropriations made for such purpose, unless such contract or obligation is authorized by law." If sections 483, 486, and 493 of title 39 of the United States Code, which generally authorize the Postmaster General to contract for carrying the mails, yield to this provision, as originally enacted, limiting expenditures so that appropriation is necessary for the employment of extra carriers, etc. (39 Op. Atty. Gen. 157), may it be logically contended that the general and indefinite terms of section 486 (b), pertaining to the consideration of the need for subsidies, would be outside the purview of such section? It is the settled and recognized policy of Congress to keep all of the Departments of the Government, in the matter of incurring obligations for expenditures, within the appropriations annually made for conducting its affairs. *Sutton v. U. S.* (1921) 256 U. S. 575.

The contracts likewise would be subject to the provisions of the act of June 30, 1906 (34 Stat. 764; U. S. C. 31: 627) which provides: "No act of Congress hereafter passed shall be construed to make an appropriation out of the Treasury of the United States, or to authorize the execution of a contract involving the payment of money in excess

of appropriations made by law, unless such act shall in specific terms declare an appropriation to be made or that a contract may be executed." As those dealing with the Government must be held to have notice of these limitations upon authority (see *Sutton v. U. S.*, *supra*), any contention that the grants or subsidies are not within the ambit of the limitations of this section is very tenuous.

If the power of the Postmaster General "to establish post offices" does not authorize him to bind the United States by a lease for a post-office building, there being no appropriation therefor (*Chase v. U. S.* (1894) (155 U. S. 489)), a fortiori the Civil Aeronautics Board may not bind the United States by a contract for the grant of subsidies in excess of appropriations. If, as stated in 6 Op. Atty. Gen. 28, one appropriation does not necessarily involve the undertaking of the Congress to make further appropriations, and does not of itself empower the President to engage the Government beyond the specified sum, it is impossible to support the allegation that the Civil Aeronautics Board may bind the Government to pay grants of subsidies made by it in excess of appropriations. The general public system for the appropriation and disbursement of public moneys is permanent, and unless charges are within the objects for which an appropriation is made they cannot be applied to that appropriation (28 Op. Atty. Gen. 634).

The foregoing observations, with references to limitations on the authority of the Civil Aeronautics Board to obligate the United States for subsidy payments beyond the amount appropriated and available, would likewise be applicable to the Board if S. 1360 were passed. There would be, however, the additional specific restriction of the bill found on page 5, lines 2-6, which reads: "Payments under this subsection [subsidies for essential aircraft operation] shall be made by the Board out of sums appropriated to the Board for such purpose, and there are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this subsection." This wording of S. 1360 also has the additional advantage over the proposed reorganization plan in that it grants a clear authorization for appropriations for subsidies as such, which is not found in the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, *supra*, the foundation for the payment of subsidies under the proposed reorganization plan.

Continuing, Mr. Chairman, the following telegram represents the feelings of most of the taxpayers' organizations in the State of New York:

ALBANY, N. Y., March 4, 1954.
Hon. JOHN J. ROONEY,
House Office Building:

As representative taxpayers, New York, we strongly oppose Clevenger amendment now pending before House to perpetuate Civil Aeronautics Board subsidies at present rate for total \$48 million for next 8 months. Since House already appropriated \$60 million for service air mail pay, what purpose do subsidies serve? Largest recipients have been getting subsidies from taxpayers' money for 16 years. When do we wean them?

GARTH A. SHOEMAKER,
President, Citizens Public Expenditure Survey, Inc.

In fairness to Pan American World Airways System which was referred to many times in the course of the hearings held by the subcommittee on the appropriation requests of the Civil Aeronautics Board, I am including without comment a letter and attached memoran-

dum received from that company. They read as follows:

PAN AMERICAN WORLD AIRWAYS SYSTEM,
Washington, D. C., March 1, 1954.
Hon. JOHN J. ROONEY,
Member of Congress,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. ROONEY: During the recent hearings of the Appropriations Subcommittee concerned with Commerce Department appropriations, you asked several questions of the Civil Aeronautics Board as they affected Pan American World Airways.

In the interest of clarifying any misunderstandings which may still exist, we take the liberty of making available to you the attached memorandum.

Sincerely,

ROGER B. DOULENS.

COMMENTS RELATING TO HEARINGS ON COMMERCE DEPARTMENT APPROPRIATIONS FOR YEAR 1955 BEFORE THE SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, 83d CONGRESS, 2d SESSION

Pages 608-610: "Reason for increased subsidy in spite of increased net revenues of international airlines."

Mr. ROONEY points out that in the year 1953 revenues for international carriers increased over 1952 and net operating income increased to \$24,250,000 in 1953 as compared to \$8,633,000 in 1952 and raises a question as to why subsidies increased in the fiscal year 1953 as opposed to the year 1952 by some \$5 million. The following items account for this increase.

1. On January 1, 1953, the Latin American division of Pan American Airways was placed on a prospective mail rate as opposed to past period mail rates. Under this change in status the return on investment in the last half of fiscal year 1953 was increased from 7 to 10 percent. On a full-year basis such a change would amount to approximately \$2,200,000 based on the Latin American division's investment for this period of approximately \$35 million. The Board's staff in preparing the estimates for the fiscal year 1953 must have assumed that the Latin American division's rate would be effective for the full year and made provision for \$13 million of total mail pay for the fiscal year as opposed to \$10 million for fiscal year 1952—\$3 million.

2. Although the two carriers, Northwest and Pan American operating in the trans-Pacific area were on final rates in the years 1952 and 1953, the level of operations for the Korean airlift was reduced as compared to the year 1952 and the profits in reduction in mail pay from the airlift operation were correspondingly reduced, thus increasing the mail pay requirements of the two American trans-Pacific carriers by some \$821,000.

3. In the fiscal year 1953 the appropriations for mail pay required for States-Alaska operations were increased over 1952 by approximately \$1,450,000. This increase is applied to all three carriers—Pan American, Alaska Airlines, and Pacific-Northern—reflects the cost of subsidization of competition over this route as contemplated in the Board's orders authorizing Alaska Airlines and Pacific-Northern to operate over this route. This competition was authorized not on the basis of need for additional service but for national defense purposes—\$1,443,000.

4. The provision for mail pay for intra-Alaska operations which might be characterized as regional or local services reflects an increase in requirements in the fiscal year 1953 over fiscal 1952 of \$1,215,000. In these operations there was little or no expansion in traffic volume which could be available to offset increasing costs due to

inflation in labor, materials, and cost of aircraft.

5. The comparative figures to which Mr. ROONEY referred relating to international airlines, as appearing in the American Aviation Daily of December 24, 1953, cover only operations of the trunkline carriers and stub-end operations of domestic carriers. None of the States-Alaska (except Pan American's operations), intra-Alaska, or Hawaiian operations were included in the figures to which he referred.

6. Of the total trunk carriers (11 airline operations which are ratemaking entities) included in the CAB statement of subsidy and mail pay for the year 1952, page 597 of the hearing records, 7 in the fiscal year 1952 were operating on temporary rates and were in review periods and the provision for return on investment would be at a 7-percent level rather than a 10-percent level.

7. We have estimated that the investments for these trunkline carriers and the stub-end domestic operations totaled approximately \$200 million in the year 1953 and that the \$24,250,000 of operating profits in the year 1953 would represent a return on investment after taxes of approximately 5.8 percent, which is substantially below what might be considered a reasonable return. If we assume an investment in the year 1952 of \$180 million, the \$8,633,000 considered as operating profit referred to by Mr. ROONEY would represent a return after taxes of approximately 2.3 percent.

Page 615: "Comparison of passenger fare and mail pay on New York-Paris route."

1. The first-class passenger fare to Paris is \$394.60 which stated in terms of fare per passenger ton-mile is \$1.01. This compares with the compensatory rate per ton-mile for United States mail pay which is received by Pan American on the Atlantic of 85 cents. The passenger weight is computed at 215 pounds per passenger. The sack of mail at the same weight, or 215 pounds, would pay \$330.77 as fare, as compared with the passenger fare of \$394.60. Mr. Kennedy in his article indicates the sack of mail pays \$1,578. This figure is determined by dividing the total amount of mail pay for subsidy received by the total number of United States mail ton-miles, which is patently incorrect. On October 1, 1953, through Executive Order No. 10 a separation was made between mail pay and subsidy. The subsidy element which the airline receives is not mail pay but is a subsidy to the entire airline operation and is comparable to the subsidy which a shipping line receives as an operating subsidy. Even though in the past mail pay included a subsidy amount, the subsidy should not be interpreted as being applicable only to mail but to the entire operation. Services which are operated under certificates authorized by the Civil Aeronautics Board are to carry out the objectives of the Civil Aeronautics Act which include the encouragement and development of an air-transportation system properly adapted to the present and future needs of the foreign and domestic commerce of the United States, of the postal service and the national defense. On many routes of a national-interest character the Board in authorizing services was fully cognizant of the fact that service mail pay could never support the operation of these routes and the subsidy element of mail pay was provided in order to carry out the objectives of the Civil Aeronautics Act including commerce.

Page 628: "Difficulty of collating divisional awards."

The divisional breakdown of Pan American's financial reports creates no problem in reconciling reported divisional figures with figures published in the annual reports. The reports to the Board are basically the same figures which are used to prepare published reports. There may be some slight change in the classifications in published figures.

However, there are no changes in basic figures.

Page 630: "Computed basis of certain distributed costs."

Realisticness of allocated figures.

Page 630: "Allocation of invested capital." Taxes.

Page 632: "Interdivisional transactions."

Page 633: "Possibility of arbitrary shifts of expenses."

All of the questions raised in connection with the above subjects have to do with the question of whether because of the divisional breakdown of Pan American's reports and divisional breakdown of areas for ratemaking purposes, there is a possibility that Pan American can obtain through duplication of expenses more mail pay than it should receive. Mr. Roth has pointed out the safeguards which the CAB uses to insure that there are no duplications between divisions. He also points out the advantages which the divisional reports make available to the CAB staff in providing economic yardsticks and comparisons in various areas of the world with competitive United States flag services. If the entire Pan American operation were to be thrown into a single ratemaking entity, there would be no basis for comparing results with other American-flag carriers.

Under the recent Supreme Court decision in which excessive profits in one division of a company may be used to offset deficiencies in mail pay in other divisions, the problem inherent in ratemaking by divisions, i. e., the possibility of shifting of expenses and revenues, etc., between divisions, becomes moot, since it is impossible to earn amounts in excess of a reasonable rate of return if the offset theory is applied. This philosophy applies so long as any division of Pan American is open from the standpoint of subsidy rate. In the Atlantic the Pan American and TWA mail rates are open from 1946 to the end of 1952, and under the Court's ruling, any excessive earnings of any division are available to offset mail-pay needs in the Atlantic.

With regard to possibility of arbitrary shift of expenses between divisions, which was suggested by Mr. ROONEY, a review of the record in Pan American's Atlantic Rate case should convince him on this score. The CAB, after careful investigation, has not challenged any of the allocations made by Pan American of either revenues or expenses. On the other hand, it has challenged TWA's allocations between its domestic and international operations to the extent of some \$3,330,000. (See Bureau Counsel's exhibit No. 259 in the Atlantic rate case.)

Pages 634-635: "Airline subsidiaries."

This section of the hearing record raises the question of whether expenses of Pan American may be increased because of relationships with affiliated companies. The CAB has reviewed Pan American's transactions with affiliated and associated companies in the Latin American Rate case covering the period 1948 through 1951 and in the Atlantic case covering the period 1946 through 1952, has found the exchange of expenses and revenues to be entirely appropriate, no adjustments having been made for improper charges. In a previous Latin American Rate case covering the years 1944 and 1945 the Civil Aeronautics Board did make some substantial disallowances in expense charges received by Pan American for the use of joint facilities of Panair do Brasil. However, even in this case the charges made were in accordance with a joint facility contract which was dictated by the Civil Aeronautics Board itself. This is the only case in which actual disallowances were made on the basis of improper inter-company charges.

The fact of the matter is that in most cases Pan American through its relationship

with its affiliated companies obtains a definite expense advantage. There are a few examples which follow:

1. In the year 1952 of the \$705,000 of expenses incurred by Pan American's system purchasing office, over \$450,000 was defrayed by commissions charged to affiliated and associated companies for services rendered for their account.

2. The system shipping department costs were \$109,000. This entire amount was defrayed by commissions earned on shipping for affiliated and associated companies and a profit was realized of approximately \$9,000.

3. Pan American maintains a United States sales office organization with some 25 offices throughout the United States and acts as general agent for many of its affiliated and associated companies. On all sales made for these companies Pan American receives a commission of 10 percent on sales. In the year 1952 these commissions amounted to approximately \$730,000.

4. In many instances the affiliated companies provided joint facilities to Pan American at a much less cost than if Pan American itself were to provide the facilities now supplied by the affiliates. In many instances insofar as communications companies are concerned and investments therein, these facilities are not only facilities for Pan American but are facilities available for all carriers located in the areas including not only other American-flag carriers but foreign flag carriers.

5. The affiliated and associated companies have created a market for the sale of Pan American's obsolete aircraft. These sales in the past have been fully reviewed and approved by the Civil Aeronautics Board. The prices at which the sales were made were as high as would have been realized if sales had been made to others in the open market. Substantial profits realized from such sales have been used to reduce Pan American's mail-pay requirements.

6. With regard to the question of miscellaneous income from investments and the allocation of such income between divisions, it should be pointed out that under the 1945 Atlantic Division Rate case and several other cases under consideration at that time, the CAB decided that profits from investments in other carriers and from operations of Government contracts would not be considered in the determination of mail pay, and in the past Pan American has considered such income as nondivisional. These investments in airlines and applicable to Government contracts have been eliminated in determining the investment base for carriers. In recent rate cases, however, the CAB has changed its position and now contends that any excess earnings on these investments should be offset against mail-pay subsidy requirements. For the future, no matter whether a system rate or a divisional rate is fixed for Pan American's operations, it would be necessary for the CAB to carefully analyze both earnings and investments in these activities to determine whether or not excess earnings are available to offset mail-pay requirements. In the presently pending Atlantic Rate proceeding this entire problem has been exhaustively reviewed by the CAB staff, and the final result of the staff's investigation will only be known at the conclusion of this case.

7. With regard to investments listed by Pan American having to do with country clubs, these are the purchase of country-club stock required in connection with memberships in these clubs and are not an indication that Pan American is operating country clubs.

Mr. COUDERT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment. In the opinion of the committee, at least those on this side of the aisle, and I hope we are joined by those on the other side, \$39 million is ample for the functions to

be performed by this agency. Let me call the attention of the Members to page 9 of the report which deals with this matter. The total amount is \$39 million, which is the amount requested by the agency, and approved by the budget. The committee did not reduce this amount 1 cent. It is the full budget estimate, in other words. An examination of the decreases proposed to be made by the agency as the result of the decrease in the amount in the preceding year showed that there would be some decrease in the total number of the border patrol. However, the committee has disposed of that in the report by requiring that the reduction from the preceding year be made in administration and not in the border patrol, because the reduction from the preceding year amounts only to one-half of 1 percent so that by reducing their administrative costs one-half of 1 percent the agency will be able to continue the maintenance of the border patrol which is 18 more than the average number of employees in the fiscal year 1953.

Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that if we are going to try to keep expenditures down and limit budget deficits and the national debt we have got to go along with the Budget Bureau and the administration in these matters.

I hope the House will vote down the amendment.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COUDERT. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. ROONEY. Since the gentleman solicited my idea with regard to the pending amendment I must say to him that I intend to support the amendment. I deplore the fact that President Eisenhower and Attorney General Brownell in their budget request cut \$3,250,000 from the Immigration and Naturalization Service. I am willing to give many millions of dollars in excess of the amount of this budget estimate to close our borders against wetbacks, Communists, narcotic smugglers, and all these other people who are walking across the border at will every day.

Mr. COUDERT. Mr. Chairman, I am very much interested. I thought we were seeing a new model of the gentleman from New York when he made his opening speech on this bill. I thought he had become a great economizer but it now appears that he wants to be a great economizer on one item and is for spending on every other item.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. COUDERT. I yield.

Mr. ROONEY. I say to the gentleman that with regard to this particular matter I am not here in the form of a new model. I have been for properly policing the borders and interested in the Mexican wetback problem for years. The gentleman well knows that I am for saving money where money can be saved. There are many items in this bill in which I agree with the action of the majority members of the committee in cutting funds; but I am not entirely in accord with them on their bill and I am not against every provision in the bill. I reserve the right to express myself

with reference to each particular item. This is one in which I disagree. And here is what the American Legion said to our committee on this subject:

WITNESS: CLARENCE H. OLSON, ASSISTANT DIRECTOR, NATIONAL LEGISLATIVE COMMISSION OF THE AMERICAN LEGION

Mr. CLEVENGER. You may proceed, Mr. Olson.

Mr. OLSON. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, I would like to read this statement if I may. It is a short statement.

The American Legion is proud of its record in the field of Americanism for more than a third of a century. I am personally privileged in having the opportunity to come before your committee for the second time in support of adequate funds for the Justice Department so that the Immigration and Naturalization Service may be given the tools with which it can discharge its responsibilities under the law.

The American Legion is grateful to your committee for permitting us to discuss this matter with you at this time.

When I testified before your committee last year (p. 238 of the hearings before your committee) I told you that the information leading up to the development of my testimony came from within our organization and not from an agency of the Federal Government. I wish to reiterate that statement in connection with the testimony I offer here today.

It is interesting to look back a year, to page 226 of the hearings on the Department of Justice, and to note there was some conflict between the assurances of the Attorney General that funds were adequate, and our apprehension that additional funds would be needed to properly carry out the program laid down for the Immigration and Naturalization Service. It is also interesting to note that scarcely 7 weeks after the beginning of the 1954 fiscal year the Attorney General, following a personal inspection of the United States-Mexican border, according to the Washington Post of August 19, 1953, was much concerned over the increase in the number of people illegally crossing over from Mexico into the United States. According to the Washington Post the Attorney General said the problem was still in an "incipient" stage.

Of course, we realize that you gentlemen of the Congress have to rely on the facts as they are given to you by responsible authorities in Government and that your actions are guided by them. We are not critical of this committee for having failed to appropriate the funds but we do criticize the Attorney General's office for having failed to ask you for the amount necessary to appreciably strengthen the Immigration Service's weak position along our Southwest border.

More recently, the magazine section of the New York Times of January 31, 1954, had a very interesting article on the wetback situation entitled, "Two Every Minute Across the Border," which was written by Mr. Gladwin Hill, of the Los Angeles-New York Times Bureau. I do not include the article because of its volume but wish to quote from it for the purpose of emphasizing several points that will follow:

"Most wetbacks have to pause at least briefly in the valley to work and get a little money before pushing northward. One objective of the patrol is to nail them before they can get social-security cards. The law does not deny cards even to illegal aliens and, once in hand, they become quasi-passports.

"The cat-and-mouse game would be comic if it were not for its evil ramifications. Because of their numbers, the wetbacks make a mockery of border supervision, transforming the line into a gateway through which foreigners of any sort can infiltrate. The wetbacks bring all kinds of contraband with

them, from drugs and parrots to venereal disease. Their direct social cost in Imperial County alone, counting everything from jailing to hospitalization for tuberculosis, has been reckoned at several hundred thousand dollars a year."

We are not here as fiscal or immigration experts. We will not say how much money is needed for the job—that is up to the Attorney General—but it strikes us as being peculiar that 1955 fund requests are even less than 1954 (p. 818, Federal Budget). We ask ourselves, What has happened to the concern of the Attorney General as expressed last August? Or, what new plan has been devised to more than offset the money and personnel decreases? Surely, the Attorney General would not be satisfied with a continuance of the rather ineffective job being done by his Department along the Mexican border.

In closing we point to the following extract from a joint release by State, Justice, and Labor dated January 15, 1954:

"The border patrol has therefore been instructed to redouble its efforts to prevent the illegal entry of Mexican aliens and their employment."

In great emergency such as war, conflagration, or flood, men can and are expected to redouble their efforts for a short span but cannot be expected to meet such tests for a year at a time. Reserves and more personnel are the answers to such demands. To provide that, the Department must have the funds or weaken the line at other points.

We have attached a copy of St. Louis national convention resolution No. 396 which is my Legion authority to appear today. If you are interested in resolutions pertaining to social security, narcotics, and other matters mentioned herein, I will be glad to provide them.

"1953 NATIONAL CONVENTION OF THE AMERICAN LEGION, ST. LOUIS, MO., AUGUST 31 TO SEPTEMBER 3, 1953

"Resolution No. 396.

"Committee: Americanism.

"Subject: To prevent illegal entrance at the Mexican border.

"Whereas the safety, security, and welfare of the Nation is the primary objective of the American Legion, which objective is impossible of attainment without enforcement of the immigration laws; and

"Whereas aliens are entering the United States illegally from Mexico in a mass migration that has reached proportions out of control of the presently constituted authorities; and

"Whereas the border States are being overrun with this invasion of aliens, which is encroaching upon the interior States in ever-increasing numbers, in defiance of the laws of the United States and in numbers which cannot be computed but may be estimated by the fact that over 400,000 such aliens were apprehended in southern California alone during the 12 months ending July 1, 1953, and

"Whereas this army of invading aliens is bringing with it poverty, disease, and crime, is loading our relief rolls, filling our public hospitals, crowding our jails with aliens having no claim to our bounty, and is displacing domestic labor, depressing wage scales and living standards, raising serious police and health problems, and creating widespread distress and unhappiness in the homes of our people by these results; and

"Whereas the breach in our defenses which is opened by the illegal entry of this horde of aliens affords a means of unregulated and uncontrolled entry into our country of unlimited numbers of hostile aliens bent upon our subversion and destruction: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved, That the American Legion in national convention assembled at St. Louis,

Mo., August 31 to September 3, 1953, call upon the President to use means at his command or to request the Congress to authorize measures to deal with this unprecedented menace to our Government, welfare and prosperity."

Mr. OLSON. I am prepared to answer questions, sir.

Mr. CLEVELER. Thank you for your statement, Mr. Olson.

ANALYSIS OF WETBACK PROBLEM

Mr. ROONEY. I wish to commend you and the national legislative commission of the American Legion for taking this interest in the wetback problem which to me has been a very serious one over a number of years now. When I was chairman of this committee this committee reported a bill which would have put several hundred more border patrolmen on the Mexican border. I hope the present Attorney General will do something about it. Mr. Brownell presently deplores the situation but has no suggestion to rectify it at the moment, or at the time of his testimony, not a word as to what to do about it. Instead of doing something about it he reduces the amount of appropriations which he requests here for the Immigration and Naturalization Service by three and a quarter millions.

That is all, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. CLEVELER. I might say, also, there was under consideration extension of this contract labor agreement between the United States and Mexico. I do not know whether it resulted in renegotiation or not, that is, where they brought them over under contract. The wetback was just surplusage of labor. Do you know whether we have renewed that agreement or whether it is terminated?

Mr. OLSON. According to the reference I made here to the joint release by the State, Justice, and Labor Departments on January 15, they were looking forward to the possibility of such an agreement. Something now seems to have erupted between Mexico and the United States.

Mr. CLEVELER. It expired?

Mr. OLSON. That is correct, as I understand it, and there has been some difficulty in their attempt to renegotiate an agreement something like they had before.

Of course, in our opinion that may not be the answer. It may help the situation. We believe that the only way, if we are going to try to prevent these people from coming over, is to stop them at the source or at the line. I realize, too, that it would be difficult to have a skirmish line extended from California to Brownsville, Tex. We have to apprehend those who slip by the so-called screen.

Mr. CLEVELER. I might say to you it is a concern of mine that we stop ship jumping and border crossing at any point and not just from Mexico.

Mr. OLSON. We have concentrated on this thing alone because of the text of the resolution. We appreciate that you have the same situation in the coastal States of this country. You have probably a bad situation in Florida. I think along the Canadian border it may not be as bad because of the stricter application of their own laws. We are not talking only of this Mexican border but that seems to be the sore point in the whole situation.

Mr. CLEVELER. There is a big flow of marijuana from Mexico but other narcotics come from other countries in greater quantities.

Mr. OLSON. People who want to plant their saboteurs and subversives here naturally would look to that area. I would if I were trying to infiltrate people into this country.

Mr. ROONEY. Are you familiar with a report gotten out a couple of months ago entitled "What Price Wetbacks" which contains many photographs depicting this deplorable problem?

Mr. OLSON. No, sir.

Mr. ROONEY. It was published by the American GI Forum in southeastern Texas in cooperation with the Texas State Federation of Labor. I commend it to you for your reading.

Mr. OLSON. Thank you very much.

USE OF CHEAP LABOR ALONG BORDER

Mr. ROONEY. This is an economic problem, and the farmers along the Texas border will not pay the American minimum wage required by law to hire Americans. They hire these wetbacks at coolie wages, as little as \$2 for a 10-hour day, with the result that our immigration laws are flouted. The immigration inspector along that border is treated with contempt by every farmer who uses wetback labor, and most of them do, including many placed very high in the State of Texas.

Mr. OLSON. I am not positive, but either the magazine article of the New York Times to which I referred or the joint release by the three departments touches on that. It suggests that possibly this cheap labor does take away jobs from our own people.

Mr. ROONEY. Not only that, this illegal labor takes away approximately, if I remember the figure, \$30 million a year. The money paid as coolie wages is not spent in the United States on our side of the border. It is sent to Mexico and constitutes the third largest source of income to Mexico, exceeded only by tourism and the mining industry. The outfit that does the biggest business along the border is the United States post office where the wetbacks buy money orders to send their wages back into Mexico. So that it harms the small-business man, the drugstore, the restaurant, and other such small businesses. All the money goes to the other side of the border. I commend that for your reading.

Mr. OLSON. Thank you very much. I believe Mr. Bow, acting chairman last year, indicated that the Appropriations Committee sort of frowned on these luxurious airplane rides to return these people back to Mexico who were apprehended and they were going to try to work out other plans for returning of these jumpers. I suppose that would permit them to use it elsewhere. We of the Legion, it may seem funny to you that we are interested in a proposition of this kind, but there are those—

Mr. ROONEY. You should be interested.

Mr. OLSON. But there are those other factors that come into it.

Mr. ROONEY. I say that as one who sometimes disagrees with the Legion.

Mr. OLSON. Thank you very much.

Mr. COUDERT. Let me remind the membership again that this bill will provide 18 more members of the border patrol than they had in 1953.

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COUDERT. I yield.

Mr. HOSMER. This approach is still a further continuation of unilateral dealing with this problem from one side of the border, and it is not a problem that can be dealt with from one side of the border only; it is necessary to have active cooperation of the Mexican Government to handle both the wetback problem and the narcotics problem. The only way to do it is to use the method we used in combating the foot-and-mouth disease, a joint Mexican-American commission. The flow of narcotics across the border can only be controlled through some such joint action. There is legislation which will come before the House to provide some such method of taking care of the entire problem.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired; all time on this amendment has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. HAGEN].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. HAGEN of California) there were—ayes 25, noes 66.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. REES of Kansas: On page 45, in lines 11 and 12, strike out the words "without regard to the civil-service and classification laws."

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, this is the same language to which I directed a point of order on yesterday but was overruled by the Chair. I do not want to in anywise injure this proposed legislation; however, I want to protect two situations. One is the civil service. I want to make sure neither is violated. The other is veterans' preference.

The chairman of the Committee on Appropriations of the House suggested that there is a law already on the statute books that does provide for the employment of certain individuals who can speak foreign languages that is so helpful in carrying out the purpose of this particular section of the bill. Then it appears there should not be the necessity of inserting this language in the bill. As I stated, I do not want in any way to injure the legislation, but I do have a letter from the American Legion legislative representatives stating that in the Mutual Security Act of 1953 there was similar language but somehow, in some way, that language was abused.

I also call attention to the fact that there is no explanation in your report with regard to the use of this money excepting, we are told, it is used to carry out this particular section of the bill.

Now, I should like to ask the chairman of the committee 3 or 4 questions. What limitation is intended under the exception granted by the language of this bill? Just to what do you limit it?

Mr. TABER. The language here would permit only persons on a temporary basis, who received total compensation not to exceed \$120,000, to be employed without regard to the civil-service laws.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Whom does the gentleman have in mind? What persons does he have in mind?

Mr. TABER. The temporary employment of people, that is all. This law is effective in here and continues effective only if it is carried from year to year in an appropriation act. That is the way the language of the authorizing act read.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Does the gentleman have a limit on the number of aliens? If not, there should be a limit.

Mr. TABER. Not on the number of aliens; no. They have to have aliens in connection with this program, they have to have people who can translate the broadcasts that we want to put out and deliver. We cannot get Americans who are qualified to do this sort of thing in the number that is required. They have to go over there sometimes and get some-

body to come in here. Under the civil-service laws they would not be allowed to employ them if we did not have this authority. I think all of these things are minor; on the other hand, they are very important to the successful operation of the program.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Does the gentleman think that the language of this bill will in anywise include employees within the United States; those employed in the information agencies generally?

Mr. TABER. Not where regularly employed. It cannot permit people who are regularly employed on a fixed salary except aliens who have to be employed for the purpose of translation or broadcasting.

Mr. REES of Kansas. The thing in which I am particularly interested at this time is that we do not use this language in any way in violation of the Veterans' Preference Act, for one thing.

Mr. TABER. It could not be used in that way, because you would not find aliens who are veterans who would be entitled to any preference.

Mr. REES of Kansas. I would not want to see it used in violation of the civil-service law unless there is an emergency where it is absolutely necessary.

Mr. TABER. It is nothing but temporary employment of somebody whom they want to do some particular job.

Mr. Chairman, in view of the statements that have been made by the members of this committee and the assurance I have received that there will be no violations of the civil-service act, rules, and regulations, and in further consideration that the Veterans' Preference Act of 1944 will not be bypassed or violated, I shall not press for the adoption of my amendment. I am enclosing herewith as a part of my statement a letter I have received from Mr. Miles B. Kennedy, director of the American Legion, wherein he expresses the interest of the American Legion in this section of the bill:

THE AMERICAN LEGION,
NATIONAL LEGISLATIVE COMMISSION,
Washington, D. C., March 2, 1954.

HON. EDWARD H. REES,
House of Representatives,
New House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN REES: Referring to H. R. 8067, same being a bill making appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce, and the United States Information Agency, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1955, my attention has been directed to the language appearing on page 45, lines 11, 12, and 13, under title IV, United States Information Agency. The American Legion objects to the same.

The Mutual Security Act of 1953 (Public Law 118, 83d Cong., H. R. 5710, sec. 706 (a)) contained somewhat similar language and the agency immediately construed the act to release them from any adherence to veteran's preference; the Civil Service Commission concurred with their construction and refused to accept any appeals from veterans who were separated under authority of this section. There was a time limitation upon the authority to so reduce personnel and without Civil Service Commission assistance it was impossible for the Legion or the veteran to ascertain if the agency even acted within the time allowed, or if the veteran came within the 10-percent figure which was also included in the act as a maximum number to be so reduced.

It is felt that if the wording of H. R. 8067, as mentioned, is not changed or stricken, it will result in a similar situation with reference to veterans' preference in appointment, and also any rights veterans may have under the reemployment phase of veterans' preference. This type of legislation not only on its face results in a partial abolition of veterans' preference, but allows the possibility of a wholesale disregard behind closed doors so to speak, and if not objected to here, the idea will tend to spread among the opponents of veterans' preference.

The American Legion would appreciate it very much if you will make it a point to look into the purpose of the language appearing in H. R. 8067, page 45, lines 11, 12, and 13, with a view to having same stricken or deleted when this measure is before the House today, Tuesday, March 2, thereby forestalling any attempt to bypass the provisions of the Veterans Preference Act of 1944, as amended.

Thanking you for your courtesy and cooperation in this connection, I am

Sincerely yours,

MILES D. KENNEDY,
Director.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, first, in reference to what the gentleman from Kansas said as to the violation of the civil-service law, I can assure him that there is no desire to violate the civil-service law. I should like to bring to the attention of the committee the justification for this language which was submitted to our committee by the information agency as the reason why this is necessary.

Language is rooted in Public Law 402, the Smith-Mundt law, which requires appropriation language to set authority for employment of persons on a temporary basis and aliens for the special needs of the Agency.

The unusual skills required by the United States Information Agency are not contained within regular staffing patterns.

For example, the Agency needs persons who can review motion-picture films which use rare languages; persons who can adapt press and publications output to the needs of a foreign area by preparation of suitable cartoons or pamphlets; or who can provide translation services in languages not available from within on a regular staffing pattern basis; or who can provide narration services for radio in foreign languages.

Most of these specialties are not of a sufficiently continuing nature to justify full-time employment of a continuing nature. Many of the specialists with the requisite qualifications do not meet civil-service standards, are not interested in applying for civil-service examinations simply for temporary employment, or are not available for temporary employment at civil-service rates.

The employment of aliens, to which this provision also pertains, is absolutely essential to the continued output of the radio broadcasting program: there are at present 123 resident aliens performing this work in New York; without these employees, 18 languages, many of them beamed to areas behind the Iron Curtain, would have to be dropped.

I submit to the gentleman that those are the justifications submitted to our committee for the writing of this language.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOW. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. REES of Kansas. If you only had the language in the act you prefer, why repeat it in an appropriation bill?

Mr. BOW. Because the Smith-Mundt Act definitely provides, I will say to the gentleman from Kansas, that this language be incorporated in an appropriation bill. Now, we strangely have this basic language saying that in order to enforce it it must be contained in the appropriation bill. If we do not put it in this bill, it would not be applicable. It is a rather strange feature, I admit, but we must put it in this bill in order to have it.

Mr. REES of Kansas. The second question: Do I understand it is the belief of this committee that the persons employed under this section are necessary employees who cannot come under or who do not pass examinations under Civil Service in order to fit those particular jobs; that you cannot recruit them from Civil Service?

Mr. BOW. I think that is true, sir.

Mr. REES of Kansas. And in no wise would this section affect the Veterans' Preference Act?

Mr. BOW. Not speaking for the committee, but speaking for this particular member, I think that is true.

Mr. GROSS. If the gentleman will yield, what is the status of these people? Are they contract workers?

Mr. BOW. Part of them are contract workers.

Mr. GROSS. This Government as of this date has 427,000 alien contract workers scattered all over the world. How many more are we going to load on the taxpayers?

Mr. BOW. I cannot answer the gentleman's question on that.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ROONEY: On page 25, strike out lines 1 to 6, inclusive.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, this amendment seeks to strike from the bill section 207, on page 25, which provides:

None of the funds appropriated by this title may be used in the preparation or prosecution of the suit in the United States District Court for the Southern District of California, Southern Division, by the United States of America against Fallbrook Public Utility District, a public service corporation of the State of California, and others.

I think the best way to argue for the adoption of this amendment is to quote the questions asked of and the answers given by the present Attorney General of the United States. At page 7 of the Department of Justice hearings we find this:

Mr. ROONEY. With regard to your request that the language concerning the Fallbrook Water District matter be deleted from the bill, what is your reason for asking that?

Mr. BROWNELL. Basically it is this: That the whole suit involves Camp Pendleton, which is one of the largest military installa-

tions on the west coast, a Marine installation. The Government bought that property not knowing what their water rights were. If the water is taken away an investment of over \$100 million would be lost. I say the way to find out what the water rights of the Government are is to do it in court, and the effect of the rider is to prevent the Department of Justice from defending the Federal Government in court and really would mean a default.

Mr. ROONEY. The rider is not in the best interests of all of the people of the United States by any means, is it?

Mr. BROWNELL. I think not.

Mr. ROONEY. And should not have been inserted in the bill?

Mr. BROWNELL. That is right.

This rider was inserted in the bill last year on a close rollcall vote.

Continuing:

Mr. ROONEY. As a lawyer, that would be your opinion?

Mr. BROWNELL. That is it exactly.

Mr. ROONEY. I am glad to see my position has been vindicated after all this time.

The Marine Corps, incidentally, is not in favor of such a rider being contained in this bill?

Mr. BROWNELL. That is correct.

Mr. ROONEY. In other words, its lawyers agree with you in regard to this?

Mr. BROWNELL. That is correct.

At page 230 of the same printed hearings on the Department of Justice appropriation we find this:

Mr. CLEVELAND. The committee will come to order.

This testimony which we will hear now is a completion of the statement which was partly covered by the testimony of the Attorney General, and we will ask you, Mr. Rankin, for your statement at this time in regard to the Fallbrook Public Utility District matter which is contained in section 207 of the committee print of the bill.

After another remark or two by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. CLEVELAND], Assistant Attorney General Rankin replied:

Mr. RANKIN. We appear before this committee asking that Congress eliminate that language from the new appropriation act.

We think it is not proper and that it does not leave the Department of Justice free to defend the United States in its legal rights; that it is not in accordance with the American tradition of permitting the trial of legal issues by the courts and a proper determination of those questions in the courts. We feel that this case, in the best interest, not only of the United States, but all of the litigants, should be tried so that the courts can determine the rights of the United States with regard to water at Camp Pendleton, and also the rights of all the other parties to the litigation. It is very important to the private parties to this litigation, in making their plans about the development of their various properties, as well as it is important to the United States in making plans concerning Camp Pendleton, that they know what their legal rights are to the use of water, the priorities concerning that use, and their relative positions regarding it. Before there can be any proper development of the whole area on any permanent basis, the interested parties must know what those rights are and what reliance they can place upon them.

That is substantially the position which was taken here on the floor of the House a year ago in opposition to this rider. I think it is unconscionable for the Congress to usurp the power of the courts on a matter such as this. This controversy should be left to the

courts, and the rights of all the taxpayers of the United States of America, not merely the litigants in the Fallbrook case, should be fairly and equitably determined. I trust the House will, in its wisdom, adopt the proposed amendment which would strike this rider from the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition, with complete confidence that the amendment will be defeated, as it has been defeated in previous sessions or, when the section was not written into the bill, it was written there by the Congress. It is manifestly impossible in 5 minutes to discuss a technical matter so complex as this. The United States bought for the Marine Corps what was known as the Santa Margarita Ranch, which had concluded a trial, lasting years, with the Vail Ranch to decide the water rights between those two great ranches in southern California. Camp Pendleton was established there. The lawsuit over water rights was not started at the instigation of the Marine Corps or of the Navy, so we have been told, but at the instigation of an employee of a former Attorney General. It was the intention of the Attorney General to file papers upon approximately 12,000 residents in the watershed in this area to settle a case involving underground water, surface water and the accumulation of water. The case involving individual rights has gone to trial. It is on appeal. A stipulation has been arrived at by which all of those 12,000 people will not be subjected to separate demands upon them to prove their water rights. If we can maintain the status quo and support a bill in the Interior Committee to build a small dam to accumulate further water, this can be settled. At no time has the Marine Corps been denied water. It is understood that the entire amount of water, irrespective of all demands, will be available to the Marine Corps, if it is needed for military purposes.

Mr. Chairman, I conclude hastily to recognize my friend, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BOW], who has been there himself to investigate this situation.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, I have been there and have investigated this, and I quite agree with everything that the gentleman from California has said as to the need for this particular bill. I am sure the Committee on this side is opposed to the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York and I hope the amendment will be defeated.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PHILLIPS. I yield.

Mr. ROONEY. I wonder whether or not, in view of the position taken by the gentleman from California and the testimony of the Attorney General, he thinks that the present Attorney General, Mr. Brownell, is incompetent or inept?

Mr. PHILLIPS. I think neither. I think a predecessor of Mr. Brownell had a young man in the Attorney General's Office who came out to California and

attempted to establish what he designated as the "paramount right" of the United States to all water and to bypass State water laws for the first time in the history of California water litigation, and if that were asserted and maintained, every State in the United States would have an interest in this suit as well as the State of California.

I yield to my friend, the gentleman from California [Mr. UTT] in whose district the property lies.

Mr. UTT. I thank my colleague, the gentleman from California [Mr. PHILLIPS]. I just want to say to the Members of this Committee that the suit has been divided. The suit on the Santa Margarita Water Co. has already been tried. It is now in the Supreme Court of the United States in the Ninth Circuit Court and there are 22 assignments of error. It is improper to continue the suit in the district court until those matters have been disposed of, because there have been 22 assignments of error based on the fact that the court did not follow the California water law. They made a decision which flies in the face of our concept of basic California water law, and the suit should not go on. The rights of the Government are not prejudiced because of the fact that they are maintained intact so long as the suit exists, and the riparian rights are in order. There is no shortage of water so far as military use is concerned. There is simply a shortage of water for the tax-free land of tenants and the Santa Margarita ranch.

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Chairman, I rise to oppose the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York. I chairmanned the subcommittee that held the hearings, both here in Washington and in California, on the Fallbrook matter.

Here are the facts: The Justice Department started a lawsuit against 12,000 small farmers, lot owners, and business people in the Fallbrook area. Because of the hardship of that lawsuit on thousands of little people, we tried to get the Justice Department to hold off the serving of summons until we could work out a settlement here in the Congress. We did work out legislation which passed this House without even a rollcall. That bill is pending in the Senate. But the Justice Department would not hold up its legal proceedings to let Congress settle the matter, or listen to Congress. The Justice Department was going to proceed, break the small landowners with the cost of this lawsuit, force them to the wall, and confront everybody with a fait accompli. These thousands of small landowners could not afford to fight for justice—the cost would force them to throw in the sponge. That situation called for action by the political agency of our Government—the Congress, and we took action to achieve justice by other means—legislation.

How do we prevent a great agency of this Government from using its financial

and other resources arbitrarily to crush the common citizen? The way to do it is cut off their money. That is exactly what we have done, and that is the effect of the provision the amendment seeks to strike out of the bill. The provision simply holds the legal case in status quo until the pending bill is acted on by the Senate, one way or the other. If you believe the Congress has the right and the good sense to do justice between the people of Fallbrook and the Federal agencies involved at Camp Pendleton, then vote this amendment down.

This is a situation in which the legal remedy is not adequate. The rights involved, except those of the local people, are rights of the Federal Government, and the property of the Federal Government. The Congress—not the Federal courts—is primarily responsible to the people of this country for the rights and property of this Government. We have the right, and the responsibility, to arrogate to ourselves decisions relating to those rights and that property, where we think the circumstances warrant—and remove the matter from the strict legalisms of the courts. We have chosen to do that previously in this particular case. We should continue the prohibition against this lawsuit in the confidence that we will make the right decision here in respect to the rights and property of the Federal Government in the Fallbrook case.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. ROONEY) there were—ayes 17, noes, 77.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. CLEVENGER. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. JOHNSON of California, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 8067) making appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce, and the United States Information Agency, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1955, and for other purposes, had directed him to report the bill back to the House with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

Mr. CLEVENGER. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the bill and all amendments thereto to final passage.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment?

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, I demand a separate vote on the so-called Clevenger amendment with regard to payments to air carriers.

The SPEAKER. Is a separate vote demanded on any other amendment? If not, the Chair will put them en gros.

The question is on the other amendments.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the amendment on which a separate vote has been demanded.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CLEVENGER: On page 30, line 80, strike out "\$23,000,000" and insert "\$40,000,000."

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. ROONEY) there were—ayes 104, noes 28.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will count. Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, in accordance with an agreement made with the majority leader, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw my point of order at this time.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York that the vote be postponed until tomorrow?

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HALLECK. I think the gentleman from New York was seeking to withdraw the point of no quorum. If we agree to that I shall then ask unanimous consent that the vote go over until tomorrow.

Mr. ROONEY. And couple with the request that the first order of business tomorrow shall be the rollcall on this amendment.

The SPEAKER. The Chair cannot make any agreement as to the rollcall tomorrow; the House will determine that tomorrow.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. ROONEY. Can we submit the consent request now that the rollcall be had tomorrow?

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HALLECK. Might I at this point assure the gentleman from New York that on our side we will see to it under the circumstances that the roll is called tomorrow if that is what he wants.

Mr. ROONEY. I thank the gentleman very much; that is exactly what I want.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from New York withdraw his point of no quorum?

Mr. ROONEY. If that is the proper thing to do.

The SPEAKER. The Chair wants to know if the gentleman withdraws it or not.

Mr. ROONEY. Yes.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that further proceedings on the measure before us go over until tomorrow.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

PAYMENT OF CERTAIN HOSPITAL, MEDICAL, AND NURSING EXPENSES

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of House Resolution 456.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That there shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House such amounts as may be necessary to defray hospital, medical, and nursing expenses in the treatment of injuries incurred in the House of Representatives by its Members during the session of the House on March 1, 1954.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and of course I am not going to, will the gentleman from Indiana explain the resolution?

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, this resolution was introduced by our colleague from Michigan [Mr. CEDERBERG], a very close friend of one of our colleagues who was injured the other day.

The purpose of the resolution is to provide for payment out of the contingent fund of the House of the necessary medical and hospital expenses for our five colleagues who were so tragically wounded on the House floor the other day. They were here on duty in the House of Representatives. It seems to me and to everyone with whom I have discussed this matter it is only fair and right that the hospital and medical expenses which they are incurring in the treatment of their wounds be borne out of the contingent fund of the House of Representatives.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK]?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I demand a rising vote.

The question was taken, the Members rising.

The SPEAKER. One hundred and ninety-four have voted in the affirmative, none in the negative.

So the resolution was agreed to unanimously, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXCISE TAXES

Mr. REED of New York, from the Committee on Ways and Means, reported the bill (H. R. 8224) to reduce excise taxes and for other purposes (Rept. No. 1307), which was read a first and second time, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union and ordered to be printed.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I do not see the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. COOPER] presently on the floor, but

I am sure he would want to ask unanimous consent that the minority views be filed also, and I submit that in the form of a unanimous-consent request.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. RAYBURN]?

There was no objection.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND REMARKS

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members who made remarks in the Committee of the Whole today be given the privilege of revising and extending their remarks and including extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

SECOND SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION BILL, 1954

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H. R. 7996) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1954, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. NO. 1265)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 7996) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1954, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 1, 2, 4, 5, 6, 8, 9, and 10, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 3: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 3, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$8,120,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 7: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 7, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$1,431,909"; and the Senate agree to the same.

JOHN TABER,
JOHN PHILLIPS,
CLIFF CLEVELAND,
CLARENCE CANNON,
ALBERT THOMAS,

Managers on the Part of the House.

HOMER FERGUSON,
GUY CORDON,
LEVERETT SALTONSTALL,
CARL HAYDEN,
RICHARD B. RUSSELL,

Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 7996) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1954, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report as to each of such amendments, namely:

Amendment No. 1: Appropriates \$600,000 for contingent expenses of the Senate, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 2: Changes chapter number as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 3: Authorizes the transfer of \$8,120,500 to the Coast Guard appropriation for acquisition, construction, and improvements instead of \$7,620,500 as proposed by the House and \$8,620,500 as proposed by the Senate. In allowing this amount it is the desire of the conferees that the Secretary of Defense shall, prior to the transfer of any of these funds, certify to the Committees on Appropriations of the House and Senate the necessity of such proposed transfer.

Amendments Nos. 4 and 5: Change chapter numbers as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 6: Increases the travel limitation of the Commission on Intergovernmental Relations to \$143,200 as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$100,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 7: Appropriates \$1,431,909 for the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government instead of \$300,000 as proposed by the House and \$1,831,909 as proposed by the Senate. The conferees in approving this amount eliminated \$400,000 included in the budget presentation for task forces which may have to be created. The Commission is in the process of organizing budget requirements for all task force work and will know better after plans are more definite whether an additional amount will be required.

Amendment No. 8: Increases the travel limitation for the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government to \$302,344 as proposed by the Senate instead of \$100,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendments Nos. 9 and 10: Change chapter numbers as proposed by the Senate.

JOHN TABER,
JOHN PHILLIPS,
CLIFF CLEVELAND,
CLARENCE CANNON,
ALBERT THOMAS,

Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON].

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, the House made some brave retrenchments in this bill and cut the estimates something like \$2,200,000. Out of the \$27,942,616 requested the House sent only \$25,785,707 to the Senate.

But the conference report now under consideration here carries \$27,517,616, reducing the saving to a little over \$400,000 instead of the \$2,200,000 favored by the House.

At this rate it will be a long road to a balanced budget and a reduction in the national debt.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The conference report was agreed to, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MEXICAN AGRICULTURAL WORKERS

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the resolution (H. J. Res. 355) amending the act approved July 12, 1951 (65 Stat. 119, 7 U. S. C. 1461-1468), as amended, relating to the supplying of agricultural workers from the Republic of Mexico, with a Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Line 3, strike out all after "the" down to and including "1461-1468)" in line 5, and insert "Agricultural Act of 1949."

Amend the title so as to read: "Joint resolution amending title V of the Agricultural Act of 1949."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COMMITTEE TO STUDY THE SEIZURE AND FORCED INCORPORATION OF LITHUANIA, LATVIA, AND ESTONIA BY THE UNION OF SOVIET SOCIALIST REPUBLICS

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Resolution 438 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That the second paragraph of House Resolution 346 is hereby amended to read as follows:

"The committee is authorized and directed to conduct a full and complete investigation and study of (1) the seizure and forced 'incorporation' of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia by the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and the treatment of the said Baltic peoples during and following said seizure and 'incorporation'; and (2) the subversion and destruction of free institutions and human liberties in all other areas controlled, directly or indirectly, by world communism, including the treatment of the peoples in such areas."

Sec. 2. The fourth paragraph of such resolution is hereby amended by inserting the words "or outside" immediately after the word "within."

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, strike out line 12 and lines 1 and 2 on page 2 and insert:

"Sec. 2. The fourth paragraph of such resolution is hereby amended by inserting immediately after the word 'within' the following: ', and after March 1, 1954, outside,'"

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment as to which I understand there is no opposition.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. Scott: Page 2, after line 5, insert the following:

"Sec. 3. The first paragraph of such resolution is hereby amended by striking out 'seven' and inserting in lieu thereof 'nine.'"

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana

[Mr. MADDEN], and yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, this is a continuation of a House resolution that was approved in the last session of this House and to some extent an extension of that resolution by providing for the expansion of the consideration by the committee of the forced incorporation by the Soviet Union of other states than the Baltic States mentioned in the original resolution. The resolution also extends the right of the committee to make certain necessary investigations outside as well as within the United States.

The resolution has the unqualified and very vigorous approval of the State Department in a memorandum which I understand came to the attention of the Secretary of State himself and was drafted by the Under Secretary of State, Mr. Smith, and which will be introduced more at length by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KERSTEN], in the consideration of the bill.

The tragic manner in which the Baltic people were duped out of their freedom was the Kremlin's first successful big bluff. It should have been called at Yalta, at Teheran, or at Potsdam. The fact that they got away with it only led to the perfection of a pattern of aggression which has been steadily and carefully expanded. In Czechoslovakia, Poland, and other Iron Curtain nations, the pattern has remained the same. Only political expediency has altered its implementation.

The three Baltic nations which had been under the Czar for more than a century, yet, had maintained their languages, their culture, and their customs. But most important of all, they maintained their innate love of liberty. In 1918 when the Russian Army collapsed, the Bolsheviks revolted in Russia and the German Army weakened and the three nations proclaimed their freedom. Almost immediately, they were besieged by the Bolsheviks. They defended their lands so successfully that the Russians finally sought peace. Each of the three nations eventually entered into non-aggression pacts with the Kremlin and, in 1921, they became members of the League of Nations.

The intent of the Soviet regime in Russia to seize the Baltic nations was demonstrated in 1918. But the strength to enforce the seizure was not mustered until 21 years later. It only came about through the Stalin-Hitler friendship pact in 1939.

Exiled diplomats and government officials of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia have testified that during the period when Molotov and Von Ribbentrop were negotiating the Germany-Soviet friendship pact, Stalin summoned representatives of the three Baltic governments to the Kremlin and ordered them to draw up mutual-assistance agreements which would permit the Red army, navy and air force to occupy strategic ports, airfields and areas. The Balts were unwilling to sign away their territorial integrity—which the Kremlin had always guaranteed; but when the Hitler-Stalin pact was followed by Germany's invasion of Poland 10 days later, they reluc-

tantly permitted Stalin to assume the role of protector of the Baltics.

They now know that the Stalin-Hitler agreement included the payment of \$7,500,000 in gold to Hitler for the Soviets' sphere of influence in the Baltics. They know, too, that in that pact of August 23, 1939 Hitler turned over the Baltic nations and a part of Poland to Stalin.

But the Kremlin was wary of Hitler and fearful of the unrest in the Baltic nations. Litvinoff—translated means the man from Lithuania—and Molotov repeatedly pronounced the Kremlin's intention to respect the sovereignty as well as the territorial integrity of the Baltic nations.

Stalin cunningly waited until June 14, 1940 before he made his master move. That was the day the victorious German army marched into Paris. That was the day when, with Hitler and all Germany looking south, Stalin issued an ultimatum to the Baltic nations. He demanded new governments in the three nations—governments friendly to the Kremlin and willing to guarantee free passage of Soviet troops. Without waiting for a reply, Red troops moved into Lithuania. The next day they occupied Latvia; a day later, Estonia.

This was Vishinsky's first big job. He directed the seizure of the three nations from Riga, capital of Latvia. His associates, Dekanozov in Lithuania and Zhdanov in Estonia eventually received the award that goes to those in the Politburo who achieve too much power. Of the three, only Vishinsky is still alive.

With the heads of the three governments jailed or exiled, and Red puppets in their places—always the leaders of the Soviet Friendship Societies—it only remained for the Kremlin to order phoney elections of Parliaments whose first order of business was to beg Russia to incorporate their nations into the Soviet Union. With machine guns strategically placed at these sessions, the elected members had to vote for incorporation or personally learn why Stalin chose to call himself the man of steel.

The fact that Hitler turned on Stalin and invaded the Baltics a year later does not alter the Kremlin's claim that the nations were incorporated into the Soviet Union. Former Secretary of State Cordell Hull expressed his concern about the Baltic nations and states that he spoke to President Roosevelt about it.

The President promised to talk to Stalin about the liberty of the 6 million subjugated people but there is no evidence on the record that he ever did.

So far as the world is concerned, the Iron Curtain rang down on the Baltic nations on the day that Paris fell to the Nazis. The Soviet pattern of aggression and the succeeding years of mass arrests, deportation, and murder cannot help but be recorded as one of the great horrors of history.

I have talked with people who saw freight cars filled with children who had been forcibly separated from their parents—dead from suffocation; with legal experts who attest that they were there when nearly 2,000 bodies were dug out of stench-laden earth; with former Government officials who have lists of

names, charges, and destination of deportation for over 200,000 people.

The Soviets made one mistake in the Baltic nations. When they fled before the Nazi armies in 1941, they left behind them enough documents to hang Stalin, Malenkov, Molotov, Vishinsky, Beria, and the entire Politburo in any court anywhere in the world.

Today, everyone and everything is sovietized from the Czech border eastward to the Pacific. The Kremlin has almost a billion people under its control. But among that billion they have the greatest fifth column this world has ever seen. Millions still remember the promise of liberty and freedom that came at the end of World War I, and the more nebulous promises of the Atlantic Charter of World War II. The hope of freedom still exists, even under the Kremlin's cruel domination. Revolt and unrest still prevail behind the Iron Curtain and those with courage continue to escape to the free world.

I believe that our American heritage demands that we do everything in our power to keep alive the spark of freedom behind the Iron Curtain. By every available means of communication, and that includes the Voice of America, we should tell the captive peoples to keep up their hope.

The Kremlin's house of cards will fall.

The extraordinary effectiveness of this committee's work is mentioned in Babson's Washington Forecast, which offers confidential advice on governmental matters, in its issue of February 1, 1954. The Babson Forecast calls this deadly documentation:

Much of the credit for the administration's new look at communism must go to the House "Baltic" Committee, headed by clear-thinking Congressman CHARLES J. KERSTEN of Wisconsin.

The committee's documentation of Soviet murder and treachery in Latvia, Estonia, and Lithuania got widespread press coverage throughout the world.

It constituted the first formidable step in regaining the world propaganda initiative for the West.

We have learned that, this week, the committee will request a new appropriation of \$175,000 to expand its documented indictment to include the rape of Rumania, Poland, and Czechoslovakia.

It is our prediction that this first request for investigative funds by a special House committee in the current session of Congress will be promptly granted.

And Representative KERSTEN will soon propose exploitation of another facet in America's new realism toward world communism.

With reference to the history of the Baltic States prior to their forced incorporation into the U. S. S. R., here is what happened between 1918 and 1940 in the Baltic area.

All three Baltic States emerged as independent sovereign republics as a result of the post World War I political settlement in that region. Originally they were part of the Russian Empire and in 1918, by the decision of their popular representative bodies, proclaimed independence. The Soviet Government—1918–19—attempted then to establish Communist rule in the Baltic countries by force of arms. This attempt, however, failed because of the

weakness of the Communist rule in the Russian Soviet Federal Socialist Republic, and because of strong armed resistance on the part of the Baltic peoples. The Soviet Government therefore postponed their incorporation to a more favorable occasion and concluded peace treaties with Lithuania on July 12, 1920; Latvia on August 11, 1920; and with Estonia on February 2 of the same year. Subsequently, or even prior to that, the Baltic States were recognized by all European governments and admitted to the League of Nations on September 22, 1921.

Their position, vis-à-vis their eastern neighbor, was strengthened still more by nonaggression pacts concluded between Lithuania and the U. S. S. R. on September 28, 1926—the validity of which was extended until December 31, 1945; between Latvia and the U. S. S. R. on February 2, 1932; and between Estonia and the U. S. S. R. on May 4, 1932.

By these bilateral treaties, the Soviet Union undertook to respect, in all circumstances, the sovereignty, as well as integrity, and the territorial inviolability of the Baltic countries.

Many official pronouncements of Soviet statesmen—Litvinov, Molotov, and so forth—can be quoted to the effect that the Soviet Union professed its firm adherence to the spirit as well as the letter of those agreements.

With the upset political equilibrium in Europe, caused by German aggression and the friendship and neutrality—Stalin-Hitler—pact of August 23, 1939, the Soviet Government had its hands free to resume its communistic expansion in the Baltic area, abandoned in 1920. The incorporation of the Baltic States was accomplished in stages, the first being the conclusion of mutual-assistance treaties between the U. S. S. R. and Estonia on September 28, 1939; Latvia on October 5, 1939; and Lithuania on October 10, 1939. By virtue of these treaties, Soviet military bases were established on their territories. The presence of these Red army detachments was later used to exert pressure on the Baltic Governments. In June 1940 the Soviet Government took further steps in its carefully planned piecemeal incorporation design. It confronted the three Baltic States with ultimative requests for establishment of new governments "capable and willing to warrant the honest execution of the mutual-assistance pacts" and "free passage of Soviet troops in sufficient numbers to guarantee the realization of the mutual assistance pact."

The next step was to stage new elections in order to elect a Parliament willing to ask for incorporation into the U. S. S. R. The candidates were named, and the whole operation was supervised by Dekanozov in Kaunas, Vishinsky in Riga, and Zhdanov in Tallinn. The new elected Diets adopted at their first session resolutions obliging the Soviet Governments of the respective Baltic Republics to apply to the Soviet Union for inclusion in the U. S. S. R. On August 3, 1940, the Supreme Council of the U. S. S. R. acceded to Lithuania's request. On August 6 Latvia was accepted, and on August 7, Estonia.

The occupation, seizure, and incorporation of the 3 Baltic nations violated every agreement previously entered into by the U. S. S. R. and the 3 countries.

Soviet occupation of the 3 countries continued until July 1941. During this time more than 200,000 people were deported, killed, or disappeared. Then, in July, Hitler attacked Russia, occupied the Baltic area, and held it until 1944, when the Red armies again returned, and they completed the annexation and incorporation that was started in 1940.

The House Baltic Committee on February 9, 1954, released the following statement, with which I am in full accord:

The Baltic committee, which I truly believe to have proven itself bipartisan throughout hearings in Washington, New York, Detroit and Chicago has seriously, and successfully, endeavored to document what happens to a nation—in this case three nations—when the Soviets move in.

The Baltic States of Lithuania, Latvia and Estonia were the first to suffer from Communist aggression. In all three countries there were only six million people—but we found, in addition to the exiles who had lost their land, their homes and their families that there were many great Americans deeply concerned with the fundamental freedom of people.

Secretary of State John Foster Dulles was our first witness. His historic statement on the principles for which our Government stands at the international conference table has—as I stated on the floor yesterday—produced notable and outstanding success at the current Berlin conference.

Our committee must finish its documentation of the illegal seizure of the Baltic nations. Many important witnesses are unable to come to the United States. It might be necessary for our small group to go to them.

But even more important is the very basic fact, brought out by testimony before our committee, that the seizure of the Baltic nations and their incorporation into the Soviet Union was but the first in a well-planned series of aggression which has now brought nearly a billion people under the domination of the small clique in the Kremlin.

The same pattern of merciless, inhumane treatment that was used in Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia in 1940 and 1941 was later used in Poland, in Rumania, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, and in the other captive nations.

A map, for example, placed before our committee as evidence and attested to by former President Herbert Hoover and General Rastikis, chief of staff of the Lithuanian Army, conclusively proved that the Nazi-Soviet Friendship Pact of 1939 sold out not only the Baltic nations but gave half of Poland to Stalin. This means that Soviet aggression in the Baltics and in Poland went hand in hand—even though Hitler never dreamed that after his death Stalin would steal Poland through phony elections first perfected in the Baltics.

We have conclusively proven, by testimony, films, and documents that Soviet Ambassador to the United States, Andrei Vishinsky, was the mastermind who subjugated the Baltic States. We ask permission to show the role he played in the ruin of Rumania.

We ask, too, that we be given the opportunity to document the maneuvers of Premier Georgi Malenkov in reestablishing the Cominform in Poland in 1947 which resulted in the bondage the Polish people now endure.

Think of it: In 7 years the most modest estimate of Poles deported from their homeland is well over a million.

Our committee hopes that, through being granted the privilege of more latitude in our investigation, we can, before this session of Congress closes, bring before you conclusive proof of a great international conspiracy through which the many are enslaved by the few. Our investigations thus far show that the story is the same, the pattern is the same, only the magnitude of the crime changes as we go from the Baltics to the Ukraine, to Rumania, Hungary, Czechoslovakia, Poland—a pattern first imposed on the Russian people themselves.

We ask for time. We ask for funds to fully expose it.

I should report to you that the Baltic Committee is probably the only one established by the House in recent years to win 14 attacks in 3 weeks by the big guns of the Moscow propaganda machine. We even have a new name. Prayda, Radio Moscow, and the entire Communist press have called us KERSTEN's traveling circus.

But from behind the Iron Curtain—through Stockholm, Sweden, comes word that brings assurance that this investigation is worthwhile. It may give you some measure of the concern our hearings have caused in the Kremlin.

"After Pravda, the entire press of Soviet Estonia, Latvia and Lithuania reprinted the attack (on KERSTEN's traveling circus) and those Balts who cannot hear the Kersten Commission in Baltic broadcasts could read in their daily papers that the Soviet crimes against their countries are being inquired into and that their case is not entirely forgotten in the democratic West."

We cannot forget the Poles, the Czechs, the Slovaks, the Hungarians, Rumanians, Albanians, Russians, or Ukrainians and others under Soviet domination any more than we can afford to forget the Balts. For who among us cannot proudly boast of ties with Europe through blood or friendship?

The day is not far off when we will have a free world of free nations and free people. And I believe that our committee should conclude its work in such form and in such manner that the red mark which the Reds have made on human history will become a matter of record that will live forever and plague the criminals responsible for it.

Through this amendment, we can achieve two objectives: We can show the Communist conspiracy for what it is. We can keep the faith, the hope, and the spirit of captive millions alive. And, through thousands of tomorrows, we can help to show those who follow us what it means to lose freedom and how it can be lost through a carefully planned and well-executed conspiracy.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 6 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KERSTEN].

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, at this time I should like to read the communication from the State Department to which the gentleman from Pennsylvania referred, as I think it sums up the situation as to the advisability of extending the scope of this inquiry. This communication is signed by Under Secretary of State Walter B. Smith, but I understand reliably that the language was formulated by Mr.

Dulles while he was in Berlin. It is dated February 8, 1954, and reads as follows:

Memorandum for the Honorable CHARLES J. KERSTEN, House of Representatives.

The following are the Department's views regarding the work of the House Baltic Committee and your proposal to broaden the scope of the committee's inquiry, as set forth in the draft resolution enclosed with your letter of January 17, 1954, to Secretary Dulles:

1. The Department considers that the work of the House committee has been wisely planned and effectively conducted. It is apparent that the hearings held to date have made a valuable contribution to United States objectives in disseminating impressive evidence of Soviet disrespect for the rights and sovereignty of small nations.

2. The Department believes that it will be beneficial to broaden the scope of the committee's work to provide for inquiry into similar cases where communism has extended its domination over free peoples. Careful, well-documented investigation of such cases would be valuable (a) to assure the captive peoples behind the Iron Curtain that they are not forgotten and that the United States does not endorse their captivity; and (b) to educate public opinion in the free world regarding Communist techniques in seizing power and the terrible realities of life under Communist rule.

This amendment expands the scope of the inquiry of House Resolution 346 originally authorizing and directing the House Select Committee to investigate the seizure of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia by the Soviets and the treatment of their peoples. Our committee is in the process of documenting and exposing the Communist seizure of the Baltic nations. We have completed a substantial part of our work with regard to the Baltics and contemplate some further Baltic hearings.

The amendment expands the inquiry so as to show the Communist subversion and destruction of freedom in countries such as Poland, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, and other areas where the ugly and inhuman Communist way of life has made itself known.

The United States has not acquiesced in the Communist enslavement of the peoples of the captive nations. Among the first of the captive nations to be enslaved by Communist aggression were the defenseless Baltic nations.

The same blueprint of Communist enslavement was imposed upon the brave people of Poland, Hungary, Rumania, the Czech and Slovak people; the peoples of Bulgaria and Albania; it was the same pattern of enslavement earlier applied by the Communists to the Ukrainian nation and to the other nations of the Soviet Union, including the first imposition upon the people of Russian, or Bolshevik terror by the small but ruthless band headed by Lenin.

I believe the work of the Baltic committee is making an important contribution to the security of the United States, particularly by keeping alive and strengthening the bond between the people of America and the peoples enslaved by communism behind the Iron Curtain.

The success of the committee thus far has been due to the fine work of the committee members and of our hard-working staff.

At this point I would like to pay a tribute to the outstanding work of one of our committee members, the Honorable ALVIN M. BENTLEY, of Michigan, who was shot down on the floor of this House Monday afternoon.

In behalf of every member of our committee and staff, we want to pay a special tribute to him and let him know that we need him back with our committee at the earliest opportunity his health will permit. Mr. BENTLEY's examination of witnesses at our hearings, particularly those in Detroit, in bringing out from witnesses the story of their actual experiences of the inhuman practices of the Communist NKVD, is an example in point. These firsthand stories of Communist cruelty practiced upon enslaved peoples were beamed over the Voice of America and Radio Free Europe and have caused violent and hysterical Soviet reaction. The experience and background of the gentleman from Michigan admirably qualify him to unmask Soviet occupation, having for 2 years been attached to the American Embassy in Hungary under Communist occupation during the trials of Cardinal Mindszenty and thereafter.

Likewise the other members of our committee have made very valuable contributions to the effectiveness of our work. Mr. BUSBY, of Illinois, and Mr. BONIN, of Pennsylvania, have, by their intelligent questioning of witnesses who experienced life under the Communists, brought out the horrors of Communist occupation.

Mr. MADDEN, of Indiana, chairman of the Katyn Forest Massacre Committee, and Mr. MACHROWICZ, of Michigan, likewise on that committee, who have the exceptional background of experience in the investigation of the Katyn Forest massacre, have likewise brought out, for the benefit of the American people and of the world, the inhuman practices of the Communists in the Baltic nations.

Mr. DODD, of Connecticut, whose experience in the Nuremberg trials, admirably qualify him, and likewise have given him a deep understanding of the Communist conspiracy. He, too, has helped pierce the curtain of deception hiding NKVD atrocities.

I would like to call attention to some of the statements made at the time when Mr. Dulles wrote this letter on behalf of our committee in Berlin and many of the other statements made in Mr. Molotov's presence for the benefit of the people in Europe. At that time he, on two different occasions, specifically referred to the Communist rape of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia to the great embarrassment of Mr. Molotov.

A reading of Mr. Dulles' statement made at the Berlin Conference shows clearly that he understood Soviet duplicity and hit hard at the history of their bloody rule over people everywhere the Communists have come to power.

I believe, Mr. Chairman, that by bringing out the facts as to the actuality and realities of the treatment of people once they fall slave to the Communists as told by the lips of those who at firsthand have experienced it is one of the most

effective ways that we can get a hard-hitting information program. But, further and more important than that, it shows that we have a real bond of sympathy with these captive nations—the peoples of Poland, Rumania, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Bulgaria, Albania, the Ukraine, the Russian people, the other peoples of the Soviet Union. That is what we must keep alive. We must keep these allies on the other side of the Iron Curtain. That is the chief motive of this committee to show our understanding for these suffering peoples and to show the realities of the Communist way of life.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. I yield.

Mr. FEIGHAN. I congratulate the committee for the splendid work they have been doing which I followed with great satisfaction. I learned that the propaganda organs from Moscow have criticized severely not only you, as chairman, but the entire committee for exposing the Communist crimes committed in the Baltic States. It appears to me that your committee has hit the Kremlin where it hurts the most. Does the gentleman not think that is correct?

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. I will say to the gentleman from Ohio who, I know, knows a great deal about the Communist conspiracy that at least on 14 different occasions since we started our hearings, Radio Moscow and the Communist radio have been screaming. I think they have been hurt and I think we can hurt them far more with this type of truth.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Further, I understand that the Voice of America has been carrying beyond the Iron Curtain particularly into the Baltic States the testimony which you have elicited from those witnesses, including verbatim testimony of many of the eyewitnesses, and that there is clear and concise evidence that the Voice of America got this story across to the people of the Baltic nations.

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. Both the Voice of America and Radio Free Europe recorded all of our hearings, I believe, and beamed them across, and the fact that we had such a violent response shows that these programs carried across the Iron Curtain.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Of course, in the cold war, we are fighting for the minds and loyalties of men, and I want to quote from a statement by one of the foremost and distinguished geopoliticians in the United States, Father Walsh, of Georgetown University, of Washington, D. C., who said:

The hotter we make the logistics of the cold war, the colder we make the probabilities of a hot war.

I agree with that statement, and I wonder if the gentleman likewise agrees with it?

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. I am in complete agreement with that, because it is my understanding of that statement of Father Edmund Walsh of Georgetown that the more sympathy and union we can create between our-

selves and the enslaved people behind the Iron Curtain, the more impossible we make it for the Communists to mold them into an aggressive force against us.

Mr. SADLAK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. SADLAK. I congratulate the gentleman on the vigorous and determined fashion in which he has undertaken his duties as chairman of this committee. I am in complete sympathy with what he is doing with his committee in this work. However, as I read the resolution, it seems to be quite all-embracing, and I wonder if the gentleman would give us a little more concrete information as to the method he intends to follow. I notice that it will take in the bamboo curtain, for instance.

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. I think we will have to use a little common sense with regard to that. I think a majority of our witnesses would come from the countries of Eastern Europe, Poland, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, and so forth. There might be a few from other areas, but the Department of State and the committee members thought it wise not to put down exact areas, because it might thereby create an obligation. But without any question, the countries of Eastern Europe will afford most of the witnesses that can be effective in such further hearings.

Mr. SADLAK. I was particularly interested to know whether the gentleman planned to go into Rumania and Hungary.

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. Oh, yes. Rumania and Hungary would be included in the countries of Eastern Europe.

Mr. SADLAK. Then, of course, the bamboo curtain takes in China, which was not so long ago in completely friendly hands. Does the gentleman plan to take in that phase now?

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. At this point I would say our first approach would be where the witnesses are most numerous and available.

Mr. SADLAK. And the same pattern or design is approved there?

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. That is true.

EXPOSE WHOLE RECORD OF RED SLAVERY

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I congratulate the gentleman and the members of his committee for bringing this very important matter to the attention of the House.

The Russian people were the first victims.

They are in the middle of a prison that has been growing larger with every communist conquest. They have been given up for lost. No one thinks of these, the first living victims of the Reds, or pleads their case with facts or figures, or offers any hope that the liberties stolen from them will ever be restored.

By ignoring their plight, our counter-offensive against communism is failing to strike at the heart of the problem.

The whole record of communist terror and subversion must be probed to its

very beginnings and revealed to all the world as the first step in rolling back this conspiracy against mankind—to the very first crime, which was committed against the Russian people, until we enlist their support by documenting the fraud and force that enslaved them, our job will only be half done.

With this in mind, we should give unanimous approval to House Resolution 438, introduced by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KERSTEN]. It would authorize a committee to conduct a full and complete investigation and study of, first, the seizure and forced incorporation of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia by the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and the treatment of said Baltic peoples during and following said seizure and incorporation; and, second, the subversion and destruction of free institutions and human liberties in all other areas controlled, directly or indirectly, by world communism, including the treatment of the peoples in such areas.

Section 2: The fourth paragraph of such resolution—House Resolution 346—“is hereby amended by inserting the words ‘or outside’ immediately after the word ‘within.’”

These two little words are important. We must know how the Communist conspiracy takes root underground and how it spreads. Obviously, we cannot take our committee past the Red army and the Red secret police, to secure evidence within the dungeons of Lubianka prison, or within the remote and forbidding slave camps in Siberia.

Therefore we must get our evidence outside from reliable and fortunate witnesses, who have escaped from the terror.

The investigation must be conducted as close to the Iron Curtain as possible, to contact refugees from the captive countries, and also Russians who have fled to freedom with the stories of Now It Can Be Told.

I believe that such a forthright investigation would pile up a tremendous moral indictment of communism; it would also provide the free world with accurate and moving testimony that could be radioed back into the dark world of communism, bringing hope that the emancipating truth is known and is actively working for the day of liberation.

The facts must be marshaled completely. They must be verified, so that the case against communism will be overwhelming.

On a number of days during the year, on occasions that mean so much to the peoples of Lithuania, Latvia, Estonia, Poland, and other nations that are groaning under the heel of Communist brutality, we offer vague promises of help.

Up to this moment there has been no sign of any supporting action.

I believe that this resolution is the first realistic step and in the right direction. Communist propaganda has enslaved people with lies. We must help to liberate them with truth, but first we must have the courage and the decision to get at the facts that will expose the deceptions.

and cruelties of communism from those who have suffered from it so that the power of world opinion will start it on the road to oblivion.

The searchlight of investigation, under the wide scope of House Resolution 438, will help to uncover all the dark crimes of communism so that they will have no place to hide, even within Russia itself.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, this resolution expanding the Baltic committee was passed out of the Rules Committee without any opposition. I simply wish to remind the Members of the House that I believe one of the most effective ways of combating and curtailing the spread of communism is the work that this committee is doing. During December we held hearings in Washington, New York, Detroit, and Chicago, and we listened to the testimony of a great number of witnesses, collected a great many exhibits which were admitted into the testimony, and those facts were not only published in the newspapers generally throughout this country but Radio Free Europe and the Voice of America carried the proceedings behind the Iron Curtain.

As chairman of the Katyn committee in the last session of Congress I can testify, to the outstanding effectiveness the work of a committee engaged in this type of investigation can accomplish. In London and Frankfurt, Germany, we held 6 days of hearings in each locality. Every day we had between 70 or 80 newspaper reporters, radio commentators, and newspapers throughout all Western Europe carrying the testimony and proceedings. Not only that, but the testimony and facts that were revealed, exposing communism in its true light, were carried behind the Iron Curtain. The newspaper Pravda, and the Warsaw newspapers and others including radio behind the Iron Curtain were making daily malicious attacks upon our committee, which was the best evidence that we were highly effective.

Congressman MACHROWICZ and I spoke at the opening of a convention of newspaper journalists in Berlin on Friday of the week when we held hearings at Frankfurt, Germany. Over 500 delegates were in attendance. Most of these delegates were journalists who had escaped from behind the Iron Curtain. A number of them were members of the underground from various captive countries.

We talked to a number of these journalists and they stated that for the first time since the war the Katyn committee had brought out facts and information revealing the true criminal and barbarous mind which is possessed by the Kremlin rulers. These facts were sent not only to the free countries but to all captive nations behind the Iron Curtain. The Communist propaganda machine was placed on the defensive for the first time by reason of the revelations recorded by the Katyn committee.

I wish to read an excerpt from a newspaper article. It testifies more than anything else to the great work which this committee is accomplishing and will accomplish. You have all read about

John Hvasta. He was the ex-GI who was a prisoner for almost 4 years behind the Iron Curtain. He said, and I quote:

"People in Czechoslovakia don't get much of a thrill out of their buildings, especially government buildings," he added. "In fact, they don't get any thrill out of their government. But here you do. At least I do, and I think most people do. We may cuss out our Government, but we appreciate it just the same."

"The word 'American' is a passport in Czechoslovakia," he said, explaining to me how he was able to travel 200 miles from his prison in Leopoldov to the American Embassy in Prague. "I never would have been taken in by Czech families along the way had I not been an American."

Hvasta was greatly interested in the freedom balloons which this writer helped to launch from the German border into Czechoslovakia 3 years ago, carrying messages of hope and friendship.

"I heard about the balloons though I didn't see any," he said. "What the people there need is exactly this kind of encouragement. All the people behind the Iron Curtain are strong for America, but they have to be reminded that we have not forgotten them. We have far more friends than we realize, but we don't take advantage of that fact."

The work of the Baltic committee will reassure the freedom-loving people behind the Iron Curtain that the free world has not forgotten them.

This means that the work of this committee through the testimony to be revealed by witnesses some of whom were leaders in their Communist captive nations before World War II will give millions renewed life and courage to continue the struggle against communistic slavery. I know that every Member of this House deplores the unfortunate wounding of a member of this committee by the Puerto Rican terrorist last Monday afternoon. ALVIN BENTLEY devoted a great service to the Baltic committee and we all hope that his recovery is rapid so he can resume his duties as a member of our committee. Of course, the same sentiments are held by all of us toward the other Members who were shot by these fanatics.

I want to commend the chairman of this committee, the gentleman from Wisconsin, Congressman KERSTEN, for the outstanding work that has been done so far, and I do hope that this resolution will be unanimously adopted.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SCOTT. Does the gentleman have any further requests for time on his side?

Mr. MADDEN. Yes.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. DODD].

Mr. DODD. Mr. Speaker, this resolution extending the life and the scope of the Kersten committee should be passed by this House.

As a member of this committee since the date of its organization, I have had an excellent opportunity to observe and to evaluate its work.

When assigned to this committee I believed that a great opportunity to render service to the cause of freedom and liberty awaited us as members of the committee and likewise awaited all

of us as Members of this Congress. That belief has been confirmed.

I saw in the establishment of this committee the first real opportunity to investigate the destruction of the free Baltic nations, Latvia, Lithuania, and Estonia by the Soviet Union.

I knew that such a committee could not undo any of the dreadful things that had happened. I knew that we could not rewrite history; that we could not bring back life to those who were murdered by the Communists of the Soviet Union. I knew that we could not free from the worst type of slavery and bondage those who are in the Soviet prison camps and jails. I knew that we could not restore liberty and decency and freedom to the hapless inhabitants of Latvia, Lithuania and Estonia who live from day to day under the heel of the occupying Soviet tyrant.

I never expected that this committee could achieve by itself the end result of our foreign policy and the ultimate objective of free and decent peoples all over the world.

I did believe then, and I believe now, that this Congress through this Kersten committee could ascertain the facts concerning the destruction of these free countries. I knew that we could write a record of what happened based on the testimony of living persons and on the availability of truthful documents and honest records.

Mr. Speaker, that has been partially accomplished and the record that has been written so far is a chapter of history that the world must never forget. This record must be completed.

It is important that this history be written now because many of those living who can tell us what happened are growing older. Soon they will not be available. Besides, the documentary material must be recorded and preserved under a proper authority.

Unfortunately there are still people in the world who do not believe that the Communist conspiracy murders, plunders and terrorizes free people wherever and whenever it gets an opportunity to do so.

There are still responsible heads of state who appear not to understand the implications of the Communist threat to freedom and to liberty. People like Nehru of India, still do not understand. Some people in our own land do not understand.

For those who are still in ignorance and in darkness in our own time, and for those who will come after us and face new problems concerning freedom and new threats to liberty, the record of what happened in these places must be set down.

By the extension of the life of this committee this mission can be fulfilled.

That is the first purpose of this resolution.

By widening the scope of this committee to include those other countries which have been dragged behind the Iron Curtain we can extend and make more complete this record. There are great numbers of individuals who are available to tell us what happened in Poland, in Hungary, in Czechoslovakia, and in the Balkan countries. From

their lips and from the records the history of this dark time can be preserved. Not only will we have made a great contribution toward the documentation of this black period, but as well, and at the same time, we can accomplish two other great objectives by the conducting of this investigation through a committee of representatives of a free people.

First, we will sustain hope in the hearts of those who are now in Soviet thrall; we will give them faith because they will know we have not forgotten them.

Secondly, we will serve notice to the world that the struggle goes on, that the people of America will never retreat from this battle for liberty and that we will never give up the struggle for peace and for freedom under law.

Before closing, let me observe that this committee, among its other accomplishments, occupies a standout position for the manner in which it has conducted its affairs.

The chairman of this committee, Congressman CHARLES KERSTEN, of Wisconsin, has been a model of fairness, of moderation, and of industrious application to the work assigned. At a time when congressional investigations are a matter of grave concern across this land, Congressman KERSTEN and the members of this committee have demonstrated that a congressional committee can investigate Communists and communism judiciously, temperately, and honestly.

For all of these reasons and for many more which the limitations of time do not permit me to relate on the floor of this House, I earnestly ask that this resolution be passed by this House.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MACHROWICZ].

Mr. MACHROWICZ. Mr. Speaker, I do not intend to take any more time than is necessary on this matter but I do want to add my words of commendation to our distinguished chairman of the Baltic committee for the splendid work he has done thus far. As a minority member of the committee I think I can attest to the fact and I can attest also to the fact that already very much has been accomplished at a relatively low cost to us if we talk in the matter of finances.

Just this afternoon we spent a lot of time debating how much we should spend on the Voice of America and our United States Information Service abroad. We appropriated \$75 million for that purpose, and very wisely, in my opinion.

With a relatively small sum of money, because the work of this committee has taken very little money, we can accomplish so much at such low cost and I am sure, therefore, there will be no dispute about the passage of this resolution.

The purpose of the work of this committee is twofold. First of all, we are conducting a psychological warfare. We are letting the people behind the Iron Curtain know that we have not forgotten them, that we still do intend to work until the days of their enslavement are ended. Secondly, we are accomplishing something that sometimes we forget

about, and that is, in order to properly face this Communist problem which we have before us we must understand it. We cannot understand it unless we study it properly. We cannot study it properly unless we see what they have done in the past and unless we accumulate all of the evidence that is available.

This committee has done a splendid job in that respect, and I am sure it will continue to do so if it is permitted to proceed under the terms of this resolution, which I heartily support and trust will be passed by the House unanimously.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. PHILBIN].

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, I compliment and congratulate the able gentleman of Wisconsin and the distinguished committee for bringing this significant resolution to the floor of the House. It will, of course, have my wholehearted support.

Full investigation of the calloused, merciless, godless persecution of millions of unfortunate democratic-minded peoples has been too long delayed.

This inquiry which covers broad scope may well be the entering wedge which will in time open up and foreshadow the liberation of these sorely afflicted nations. It will give new heart and new courage to the oppressed and persecuted.

It will also serve to inform the free world as well as peoples behind the Iron Curtain of the enormity, barbarity, cruelty, and savagery which have characterized the Soviet program of infiltrating, consolidating, and incorporating these freedom-loving peoples into the ideological, military, territorial, and political orbit of world communism.

The investigation will reveal to the world the unconscionable excesses of the Communists, not only those destructive of liberty and violative of humanity, but in the broader sense, those which have so diabolically stifled the national sovereignty, political independence, and social justice of the oppressed nations.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BONIN].

Mr. BONIN. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the Baltic committee to investigate the illegal seizure of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia by the Communist overlords of Moscow, I rise to support the House Resolution 438. The Baltic committee saw and heard witnesses who portrayed the most dastardly acts of barbarism to the helpless people of these proud nations. Our committee established a new precedent of recreating, for the future benefit of free people, the method in which ruthless dictators deprive millions of people of their freedom, liberty, and independence. It was clearly shown that Andrei Vishinsky, the Soviet representative to the United Nations, wilfully and maliciously participated in the rape of Latvia and was responsible for the massacre, murder and imprisonment of thousands upon thousands of freedom-loving people.

Our hearings established the fact that the word of Communist dictators cannot be believed. In the case of the three

Baltic nations, the dictators of Russia entered into solemn compacts, treaties and agreements and, within a short span of 20 years and at the outbreak of the Second World War, the Government of the Soviet Union, on various pretexts and unfounded allegations, violated all the treaties signed by them and proceeded with the occupation of these indefensible countries. On May 29, 1940, Lithuania was presented with a menacing note from Moscow charging the Lithuanians with letting their foreign agents kidnap and torture two Red army soldiers in order to force them to disclose military secrets. The Lithuanian Government officials sought to clarify this incident which actually had been inspired by Moscow agents. Sixteen days later, the proud nation of Lithuania was handed an ultimatum from Moscow demanding the immediate formation of a new government acceptable to the Communist dictators and also for the admission of new troops to occupy all of the important centers of that nation. Substantial Red army contingents had already been placed at strategic points in pursuance to the Mutual Aid Pact between the Soviets and Lithuania. Being unable to resist these demands, the Lithuanian Government capitulated on June 15. The occupation of all Lithuania by the Red troops began immediately.

Then, to add insult to injury, the Soviet News Agency, Tass, informed the world that the Baltic nations had conducted a military alliance against the Soviet Union, to justify their ruthless action against the freedom, independence, and sovereignty of these helpless nations. We heard the same identical charges preferred against Estonia and Latvia and with the same type of hypocrisy—in accordance with the plan of deceit, lies, and hypocrisy which is ever present in the dealings of the Russian Commissars. Red troops occupied all three of these little nations. This is demonstrative proof that no solemn agreement entered with the Communists can be relied upon by any nation of the free world.

The most recent demonstration of their subterfuge occurred in Berlin and, as a result of the Russian conduct at the Berlin conference, Secretary Dulles was able to use the information supplied by our Baltic hearings to prove the Communist leaders had no intention of abiding by the rules of honesty and decency.

The resolution under consideration at the present time, expands the activities of the committee in order to prove to the world that the same identical pattern was used by the Russians to take over Poland, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Rumania, and Bulgaria. Our committee, under this resolution, will establish that these governments came under the domination of Communist influence as a result of the use of lies, chicanery, murder, and other means by the Russians.

I earnestly urge the Members of the House to unanimously adopt this resolution.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. GORDON].

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include a letter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Speaker, I wish to declare my full support of House Resolution 346, as amended by House Resolution 438. The resolution, as amended, sets up a select congressional committee to conduct a complete investigation of the incorporation and seizure of the Baltic nations—Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia—by the U. S. S. R., as well as the Kremlin's subversion and destruction of free institutions and liberties in other countries such as Poland, Czechoslovakia, Rumania, Hungary, and other captive nations now compelled by Communist tyranny to remain behind the Iron Curtain.

It is clear that the seizure, merciless and inhuman domination of these countries is part of a well-defined pattern of Soviet Communist imperialism, which has brought nearly a billion people under the domination of the Kremlin clique. There are some 15 millions in forced labor camps in Soviet Russia. Since 1939 a total of 264,200 square miles has been brought under direct Soviet imperialistic and Communist control. The validity of the Soviet claim to the countries and territories in these areas rests principally upon sheer force and brutality.

The U. S. S. R. occupied Estonia, Lithuania, and Latvia in June 1940 and these countries were annexed by Soviet decree in August of that year. In the meantime, the flower of Polish leadership and thousands upon thousands of other freedom-loving Poles have been deported to arctic Russia and to Siberia. Many others have been executed without trial. Polish industry and mining are under the control of the Soviet Union. The Polish people are compelled to do without basic needs while the Kremlin reaps the Polish harvest. The formerly free Polish farmer, miner, and worker has now been forced to become in effect a Soviet serf, chained to the slave farm collectives, mines, and factories.

This resolution, as amended, recognizes that savage crimes against humanity have been committed in Poland, in the Baltic States and elsewhere behind the Iron Curtain, and that natural justice demands that there be presented to the world the evidence of the crimes, the identity of the criminals and the manner in which the crimes were committed. It is important to know how the criminals were able to subjugate these peoples and the methods and individuals who were used in the diabolic process. We must have a public record of Soviet crimes for the whole world to see and to this end we must collect all of the information in one place under official auspices.

Mr. Speaker, I feel that it is entirely fitting and appropriate that this inquiry should be made by a select committee of the United States Congress, which is the very backbone of our free and democratic form of government.

Mr. Speaker, I include at this point in the RECORD a letter from the Polish-American Congress, Inc., Illinois division, in support of the resolution, as amended:

POLISH AMERICAN CONGRESS, INC.,
ILLINOIS DIVISION,
Chicago, Ill., February 27, 1954.
The Honorable THOMAS S. GORDON,
Representative in Congress, Illinois
Eighth District, House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. GORDON: It is our understanding that House Resolution 438 comes up for a vote in the House of Representatives on Tuesday, March 2. We would be extremely grateful to you for any support you can give toward adoption of this all-important resolution.

We have given this resolution careful study and sincerely believe the best interest of the United States can be served if the present Baltic committee's investigation is extended to include a study of Soviet Russia's bizarre and illegal seizure of Poland and her neighbors.

Our files are replete with reports of inhuman treatment and persecution of the Poles by their present Communist rulers. These Soviet-dominated rulers seized Poland and the other countries covered by the proposed resolution through the most outrageous act of treachery ever recorded by history.

Extension of the Baltic committee's investigation can be the best answer to those in our country who still cling to their belief that Russia can be trusted to keep her agreements. It will likewise best serve to support President Eisenhower and Secretary Dulles in their bold determination to contain Soviet expansion.

As Americans, we are deeply concerned that the United States have as many supporters in Europe as possible. So long as the Soviets realize America has not abandoned her traditional position of freedom and justice for all mankind, they will not dare start a third war. Exposure of all the facts leading to the enslavement of our traditional allies—including Poland—by the Soviets is undoubtedly the most forceful way we can demonstrate to those poor victims of Communist aggression that this country has not forgotten them.

It is for these reasons that we earnestly hope you will add your support to this vital resolution, House Resolution 438.

We would be greatly honored to learn your own observations on this subject.

Respectfully yours,

ROMAN C. PUCINSKI,
President.
(For the Board).

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from California [Mr. HAGEN].

Mr. HAGEN of California. Mr. Speaker, it is not generally recognized in this Congress that California is the third ranking State in the United States in wool production. California's many attributes and the myriad of crops grown there have tended to overshadow the importance of wool. Yet, wool production is an important segment of the economy of the State, particularly the San Joaquin Valley, of which the district which I am privileged to represent is an integral part. As a matter of fact, the major portion of California's wool production is in my district.

I mention these points, Mr. Speaker, as a preliminary to calling the attention of this body to H. R. 7775, on which hearings began today before the Com-

mittee on Agriculture. This bill embodies the Administration's recommended wool-support program and is vitally needed to spur domestic production of this product, whose critical and essential character for military needs has been recognized by both the administration and Congress. The Congress has set by statute a production goal of 360 million pounds of shorn wool per year in the United States. This figure has not been attained under the present program in the face of import competition. In fact, the number of sheep in California and in the Nation have declined during the past year until we have 800,000 fewer breeding ewes in the Nation today than we had 12 months ago.

Those of us in the House who represent wool-producing areas are hopeful that the wool program can be enacted into law as soon as possible and without being hampered by amendments affecting other commodities.

To complete the task of attaining adequate domestic wool production one other action is required. Before the President of the United States is a recommendation of the Tariff Commission affecting wool imports which was arrived at after 8 months study. Although I am not acquainted with detailed findings of the Commission, the facts presented at hearings several months make it self-evident that additional fees on imported wool not only are desirable but absolutely essential. Due to the great amount of wool which is imported annually the present price support program for wool never has been able to operate as was intended by Congress.

Domestic wool is continuing to accumulate in Government inventory. The wool program thus far has cost the Commodity Credit Corporation \$90 million. This does not include any possible losses which may accrue on the nearly 100 million pounds of wool now in Government storage, nor on the 35 million pounds now under appraisal from the new clip, much of which is likely to be foreclosed upon by the Government. The cost of storage on wool now in Federal inventory is \$100,000 a month. The establishment of a higher import fee to enable the sale of that wool into the domestic market without loss to the Government, in my judgment, would be an important economy measure on behalf of all taxpayers of the United States.

Taking these facts into consideration, officials of the Department of Agriculture as well as representatives of the wool industry urged the Tariff Commission to fix a higher import than that now existing. My best advice is that an increase of 12 cents per clean pound is required to protect both the Government support program and the industry up to the support level. This move is considered necessary to provide for an orderly transition into the new program, if and when the Congress approves it. I have therefore urged such decisive action upon the President. This is not to say that I am an advocate of the high tariff in all instances. As a member of the minority party in Congress, I subscribe

to the theory of free trade in most instances. However, this case is one in which I believe increased import controls are dictated.

I might underscore the effect of the plight of the wool industry on our economy by pointing out that county assessors in California have begun setting lower valuations on sheep for tax purposes because of the low income of the sheep industry. Upon this valuation of sheep and the land on which they graze rests a portion of our tax revenue for school districts and other districts and county governmental functions.

There is another factor as far as California is concerned. In my district thousands of acres are going out of cotton production through the imposition of quotas on the 1954 crop. Action to bring the income from wool more nearly into balance with the production of other agricultural commodities can do much to alleviate the loss of revenue created by the required diversion of these acres to other agricultural production. This will ease, to some degree, the ill effects upon the San Joaquin Valley's economy which will result from the imposition of the cotton acreage quotas.

To my mind there is no question of the clear-cut need for adoption by the Congress of the bill embodying the new wool program and executive action increasing the import fee on foreign wool.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. FEIGHAN].

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, the Kersten committee is deserving of high praise for their work in exposing the manner in which the world Communist conspiracy works.

The committee has exposed the utter worthlessness of any agreement or treaty with the Moscovite conspiracy.

The whole history of Moscow indicates that they use any agreement or treaty with another power as a means of further extending their empire.

What they actually do is to use a legal instrument, so recognized by the standards of civilized man, to commit illegal acts which lead to the downfall of independent nations and their incorporation into the empire of Moscow.

I laud the committee for the wonderful job it did in pointing out the manner in which the madmen of the Kremlin forced the Baltic States to enter into nonaggression pacts with them and the manner in which these pacts were used to destroy the sovereign independence of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania.

Another major contribution of the committee was the manner in which they identified one Andrei Vishinsky as the mastermind behind the subversion of the sovereign independent State of Latvia.

The committee proved beyond any doubt the criminal activities of Vishinsky in bringing about the forced annexation of Latvia into the empire of Moscow.

I am happy to note that the committee did not hesitate to point out that this is the same Andrei Vishinsky who heads the Russian delegation in the U. N.

I am only sorry that Vishinsky did not accept the invitation of the committee

to appear before it and face the irrefutable evidence compiled by the committee against him.

In any case, Vishinsky has been properly branded as one of the outstanding international criminals of our day.

In my opinion the methods of inquiry developed by the House Baltic Committee should be extended to inquire into the illegal annexation of all the nations now enslaved by Moscow. This is a very large undertaking, but one in which, I am sure, the committee will have the same kind of success they have had in investigating the annexation of the Baltic States. Such an investigation will make it clear to all the people held captive within the Communist empire that the Government of the United States has not deserted them and that the inevitable day of the triumph of human freedom over slavery is not too far off.

In my considered judgment the Congress could strike a real blow for peace and freedom by authorizing the House Baltic committee to extend its investigation into all the nations enslaved by the international Communist conspiracy.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. CANFIELD].

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, as I rise to support the Kersten resolution, House Resolution 438, the words of John Hvasta, Hillside, N. J., youth, who recently escaped from behind the Iron Curtain, seem to ring in my ears. It is part of his testimony that the name "American" served as sort of a passport in his house-to-house and town-to-town journeys and concealment, all leading to his final penetration of the curtain and his return to his loved ones at home. According to John Hvasta, America has more friends behind the Iron Curtain than is generally realized. These subject peoples hunger for news from the land of the free and the home of the brave, and their courageous underground movements are sustained by events such as are now taking place on the floor of this House.

Dr. Gustave Kosik, chairman, and John C. Sciranka, secretary and editor, American Friends of Slovak Freedom, Passaic, N. J., in my district, urge speedy enactment of the Kersten resolution, and so does Mary M. Kizis, director of the Lithuanian Information Center, of New York, speaking for many Americans of Lithuanian extraction among the people I am privileged to represent.

Peoples now reduced to slavery know that ultimately the truth will make them free, and this resolution provides some of the mechanics for getting the truth.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered. The resolution was agreed to, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

NATIONAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE FOR AERONAUTICS

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Resolution 453 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 7328) to promote the national defense by authorizing the construction of aeronautical research facilities by the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics necessary to the effective prosecution of aeronautical research. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill, and shall continue not to exceed 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Armed Services, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. COLMER], and yield myself 1 minute.

This is a resolution to promote the national defense by authorizing the construction of aeronautical research facilities by the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics necessary to the effective prosecution of aeronautical research.

Does the gentleman from Mississippi have any requests for time?

Mr. COLMER. I have no request for time, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered. The resolution was agreed to.

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for consideration of the bill (H. R. 7328) to promote the national defense by authorizing the construction of aeronautical research facilities by the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics necessary to the effective prosecution of aeronautical research.

The motion was agreed to. Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for consideration of the bill H. R. 7328, with Mr. GRAHAM in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill. By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may desire.

Mr. Chairman, this is a bill that has been reported out unanimously by the Committee on Armed Services. It is a bill to promote the national defense by authorizing the construction of aeronautical research facilities by the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics, necessary to the effective prosecution of aeronautical research.

This legislation would authorize additional construction, and purchase and installation on additional equipment, at the Langley Aeronautical Laboratory at Hampton, Va., which is a high-speed,

hydrodynamic facility, costing \$1,220,000; alterations to two small supersonic tunnels at the Ames Aeronautical Laboratory, Moffett Field, Calif., at a cost of \$349,000 and alterations to an existing supersonic tunnel, air drier for propulsion systems laboratory, air heater for altitude test chambers, and rocket engine research facility at the Lewis Flight Propulsion Laboratory at Cleveland, Ohio, at a cost of \$3,431,000.

Any of these approximate costs that I have enumerated are authorized to be varied upwards 5 percent to meet unusual cost variations, but the total cost of all the work so enumerated shall not exceed \$5,000,000.

This legislation is requested by the Defense Department, following a thorough study and endorsement by the Budget Bureau. I might say also that it is in keeping with the National Advisory Committee on Aeronautics program of the past several years to keep its construction legislation consistent with the military construction authorizations.

I do not desire to burden the House with any lengthy remarks in support of this legislation, but I believe that in view of developments there is certain pertinent information that should be given this afternoon.

About 2 weeks ago, our Nation was startled to see reproduced on the front pages of our daily press and in the principal news magazines, photographs of two advanced design, long-range bombers in quantity use in Russia. To me this is clear evidence that any Nation, unfriendly, as well as friendly, can build military aircraft and missiles of increasing capabilities.

Here in the United States, the agency which carries the heavy responsibility for providing the major portion of new basic aeronautical information, from which can come the design of tomorrow's airplanes and missiles, is the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics. We hear very little about the work of the NACA, as it is known, because this agency is modest almost to the point of being bashful. At this time, however, I believe it is important to recognize how vital is the work this agency is doing.

Last year, almost on the eve of the 50th anniversary of the first powered flight in the world, by the Wright brothers, two aeronautical events took place which, to say the least, forecast in sober terms the shape of things to come. The first was a series of successful first flights by the North American F-100, America's first production fighter, capable of supersonic speed in level flights. The second was a flight by Maj. Charles E. Yeager, USAF, in a Bell X-1-A on December 12, 1953, during which he reached the phenomenal speed of $2\frac{1}{2}$ times the speed of sound—1,600 miles per hour.

These achievements climaxed the little publicized but deadly earnest effort which began during the closing days of World War II, an effort in which the NACA played a vital part along with the military services of our aircraft industry.

The goal ahead was flight at supersonic speeds, flight faster than sound. At the time that the scientists of NACA applied themselves extensively to the

program, the top speed of our military aircraft was less than 500 miles per hour. In less than a decade, the speed of production type tactical military airplanes has been virtually doubled and in special research airplanes such as Major Yeager was flying, the speed has been more than tripled.

That, I submit, is real progress.

But unfortunately America cannot rest on its aeronautical laurels. We know that halfway around the world there are other scientists applying themselves to the problems with at least equal vigor. We know also that such effort, by those unfriendly scientists, is being supported 100 percent by a government which respects only superior force.

It is an equally sobering fact that the scientific problems associated with supersonic flight today are increasing in number, complexity, and expense. Many of these important problems, to be solved as completely and as quickly as the national interest demands, require the use of research tools.

The NACA, it can be said, is constantly modernizing the research equipment it now has. However, new equipment is also needed from time to time. The proposed legislation before us is designed to provide for these alterations as I enumerated at the beginning.

To sum up, both the potential of our atomic weapons and our defense against such weapons depend in major part on superior aircraft and missiles. By virtue of an immense effort, this country now holds a position of leadership in many areas of aeronautical science.

But no complacency is justified in view of the high scientific and technical capabilities disclosed by the Soviet, whose progress includes that in nuclear weapons. It cannot for one moment be assumed the Soviets will not likewise make advances in aeronautical science which we know to be possible.

I feel certain H. R. 7328 will receive prompt and wholehearted support of all Members on both sides of the aisle.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHAFER. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. I have not had a chance to read the report very carefully, but can the gentleman tell me this: There cannot possibly be any funds in this bill for the Truman Airport at Grandview, Mo.?

Mr. SHAFER. Not in this legislation.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, this bill does not call for a large expenditure of funds but it is an extremely important bill. Those of us who are charged with the responsibility, as this Congress is, of protecting and defending the United States of America, know that we must have air power. We know that especially in this phase of national defense scientific exploration is extremely important.

We are blazing a trail in aviation, and without proper experimentation and scientific support, we cannot hope to lead the world in air power and air developments. This bill is a distinctly forward step in the progress of air power

throughout the United States and in our national defense. As America moves steadily forward into the supersonic era, it is becoming increasingly apparent that the task of America's aircraft industry to create the designs which will meet the operational and performance requirements of the military services is a gigantic one.

Actually, air power in the United States is composed of three indispensable elements: The military services which determine the requirements for new aircraft, and make use of them; the aircraft industry, which designs and constructs the new aircraft; and the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics—better known as the NACA—which provides much of the foundation knowledge about aerodynamics, hydrodynamics, jet propulsion, and all the other complex subjects for use by the aircraft designers.

That is what the NACA exists for, to supply as the fruit of its scientific laboratory research in aeronautics, the new knowledge which will enable design of aircraft and missiles of superior performance.

Actually, the NACA research programs have both the long-range, all-inclusive objective of acquiring the new scientific knowledge essential to assure American leadership in aeronautics, and the immediate objective of solving, as quickly as possible, the most pressing problems, thereby assuring the success of America's current supersonic aircraft construction program.

During its 39 years' existence and especially since World War II, the President and Congress have recognized the tremendous responsibilities of the NACA and have supported this Federal agency in its intensive program of fundamental scientific studies in the several fields of aeronautical science. Today the NACA operates 3 research centers, 1 at Langley Field, Va., another at Moffett Field, Calif., and the third at Cleveland, Ohio. Here are nearly 7,000 scientists and necessary supporting personnel. Much of the work they are doing is on an around-the-clock basis.

Consider for a moment, gentlemen, the kind of performance that we are demanding from our new fighters and bombers. In addition to being able to fly at supersonic speeds, they must have the necessary range to enable accomplishment of their fighter or bomber missions.

They must, of course, be maneuverable. Their qualities of stability and control must be sufficiently manageable to permit satisfactory operation by their pilots. By their design and construction, these new aircraft must be capable of avoiding, or at least withstanding, the manifold problems of flutter, buffeting, and aerodynamic heating—problems which become more and more serious and complex as speeds increase.

To give but a single example, it has been publicly stated that the power required to operate the refrigeration equipment for one of our newest high-speed aircraft is greater than the output of the most powerful of our World War II aircraft engines—think on that a moment, gentlemen.

This is so, of course, because of the heat barrier which looms ahead. Actually, in the field of guided missiles, the heat barrier is a very real thing, right now. Missiles are being flown at speeds four times that of sound, and faster. When a missile maintains such speed, 2,500 miles an hour or more, the temperature of its outer surface or skin, can rise to 900 degrees or more Fahrenheit, a temperature beyond that where aluminum can hold its strength.

There are other aeronautical problems of equal urgency and importance. Take, for instance, what happens in the transonic speed range. Here the flight of the airplane is subject to two entirely different sets of aerodynamic laws, one of them pertaining to speeds lower than that of sound, the other pertaining to speeds faster than sound. The degree to which one or the other of these sets of aerodynamic laws is paramount, or is influenced by the other, is constantly changing.

We have, due to the inventiveness of NACA scientists, within the past few years been able to construct new wind tunnels which were useful in the study of flight problems in this transonic speed range. But even so, we have been unable to develop the mathematical means for predicting accurately aerodynamic behavior in the transonic speed range, and as a consequence, have been forced to depend on building up the necessary experimental data for each new design. We have yet to learn the extent to which detailed information about one specific design can be applied successfully to other designs.

One of the greatest difficulties in providing such vitally needed information has been the development of the research tools with which to provide it. H. R. 7328, the bill before you, is to provide authorization for the NACA's 1955 construction program, to enable acquisition of some of the new, sharper research tools which are needed for the solution of today's urgent aeronautical problems.

Mr. Chairman, I am not going to further take up the time of the committee this afternoon to go into the details of the bill. I am merely going to say that it is extremely important to our national defense. There is no opposition to it on either side. Certainly everybody I know here on this side is very strongly in favor of the quick enactment of the provisions of this bill this afternoon.

In addition, we have a man on this side of the aisle, the gentleman from North Carolina, who has spent a long time working on this type of legislation, supporting the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics, Mr. DURHAM, of North Carolina. In my judgment, he is an expert, if there is an expert in Congress in the field of that type of legislation supporting the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics. So, Mr. Chairman, I conclude my remarks at this time and yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DURHAM].

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. Brooks] for his statement that I

qualify as an expert on these matters. I do not believe I am an expert in this field, but I do feel the House is entitled to an explanation of why we bring this legislation here in this form. This agency has been operating since 1914. It operated for many, many years under a few words in an appropriation bill authorizing the NACA agency. Over this period of time, it did most of its work in a small way without having too great expenses. So at the end of the war, the committee felt that this agency should be brought under the control of the House. We wrote the first Civil Aeronautics NACA bill authorizing this agency by an act of the Congress. We put them on a yearly basis for authorization for their appropriation, which I feel is the thing to do because in a field of scientific instruments which changes so fast to authorize a tremendous sum of money for a long period of time was not thought to be wise by your committee because the change in these scientific instruments is almost continuous. That is the primary reason why this bill is here today. We set up this basic, fundamental agency which, in my opinion, is the heart of the Air Force of this country. Our Air Force could not function today without the tools and the scientific analysis made of these tremendous speeds and temperatures and other things involved in the field of aerodynamics today.

This agency of our Government is today performing one of the most important positions in our ever increasing airpower. Around it we have built what today is the strongest airpower force in the world. This agency work is conducted by a group of scientific men under the direction of Dr. Hugh L. Dryden, a man who has contributed most of his life to the development of what we call the military plan in the basic law.

This gentleman is the very heart of our airpower both domestic and military. Today's planes have justified our confidence in this agency. It has performed in a manner that should make every American proud of what has been accomplished. I trust no one will object to this bill, as it is necessary.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, we have no further requests for time.

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Chairman, we have no further requests for time.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, pursuant to subsection (b) of section 1 of Public Law 672, approved August 8, 1950 (50 U. S. C. 151b), the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics is authorized to undertake additional construction, and to purchase and install additional equipment at the following locations:

Langley Aeronautical Laboratory, Hampton, Va.: High-speed hydrodynamic facility, \$1,220,000.

Ames Aeronautical Laboratory, Moffett Field, Calif.: Alterations to two small supersonic tunnels, \$349,000.

Lewis Flight Propulsion Laboratory, Cleveland, Ohio: Alterations to an existing supersonic tunnel, air dryer for propulsion systems laboratory, air heater for altitude test

chambers, and rocket engine research facility, \$3,431,000.

Sec. 2. Any of the approximate costs enumerated in section 1 of this act may, in the discretion of the Director of the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics, be varied upwards 10 percent and, with the concurrence of the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, by such further amounts as may be necessary to meet unusual cost variations, but the total cost of all work so enumerated shall not exceed \$5 million.

Sec. 3. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated not to exceed \$5 million to accomplish the purposes of this act.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 2, line 11, after the word "upwards", strike out "10 percent and, with the concurrence of the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, by such further amounts as may be necessary" and insert "5 percent."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. GRAHAM, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 7328) to promote the national defense by authorizing the construction of aeronautical research facilities by the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics necessary to the effective prosecution of aeronautical research, pursuant to House Resolution 453, he reported the same back to the House with an amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The bill was passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONNEL STRENGTHS OF THE ARMED FORCES

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table H. R. 2326, an act to amend the act of August 3, 1950, as amended, to continue in effect the provisions thereof relating to the authorized personnel strengths of the Armed Forces, with a Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment as follows:

Line 7, strike out "1958" and insert "1957."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was agreed to.

FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A further message from the Senate by Mr. Carrell, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 7996) entitled "An act making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1954, and for other purposes."

The message also announced that the Senate had ordered that the House of Representatives be requested to return to the Senate the engrossed bill (S. 1138) entitled "An act for the relief of John Soudas."

DO WHAT IS BEST FOR THE COUNTRY

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, each day we are beseeched by mail and by visits from various organizations urging us to do something special for them. They may want an increase in certain benefits they may be receiving or a reduction in the taxes they may be obliged to pay. Not infrequently their concern is not what may be for the benefit of anyone but themselves. They say they want economy, but they want the other fellow to take the cut. They say they want a balanced budget, but they are the only ones entitled to a tax reduction.

This is not the attitude of the great majority of American people. I should like to read to the House a letter I received from a constituent of mine who lives in the small community of Wellington, Ill. I do not know him. Nor is it particularly important for our thought here whether you entirely agree with his views. The important thing about this letter is the refreshing, encouraging attitude it expresses. He wants only that which he believes is in the best interests of the country, and obviously, he is willing to make whatever personal sacrifices that may be necessary.

I read this letter because it is so typically and so truly American:

DEAR MR. ARENDS: From what I read in the newspapers, it seems to me that the House of Representatives should follow the lead of the Senate and support the plan for the St. Lawrence Seaway.

Having only 1 dependent, my income tax was \$114 this year. An increase in exemptions for those in the lower income brackets would seemingly benefit me. But I don't think so. We not only need to balance the budget but what about starting to reduce the national debt?

Business conditions are not bad, they are normal. In normal times there are always some unemployed and a few farmers or other businessmen going broke because of poor management.

Let's reduce or eliminate (where practical) the subsidies for we farmers, airlines, business, transportation, etc.

Sincerely,

LOUIS A. ZIEBART.

MORE SMOKES FOR VETERANS

Mr. BECKER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include certain correspondence.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. BECKER. Mr. Speaker, I greatly appreciate the opportunity given me to acquaint the House with a development affecting our veterans which I feel will be applauded generally.

For a long, long time it has been possible to give tax-free cigarettes to veterans in Federal hospitals. Strangely enough this could not be done in the case of servicemen or veterans who chanced to be hospitalized in State institutions. So we have had a condition of inequality and discrimination that has been really cruel.

However, that has now all been changed.

We are now assured of more smokes for veterans.

In a letter that has just come to me from Deputy Commissioner O. Gordon Delk of the Internal Revenue Bureau, I am advised that that Bureau has set up regulations respecting tax-free cigarettes that cut through the discrimination I have mentioned. Under the new regulation, veterans' organizations and other groups can now distribute tax-free cigarettes also to veterans in State hospitals. This will be a tremendous encouragement to them. It will widen greatly their opportunity to be of service, to be of comfort. Veterans' organizations have been doing an outstanding work, a very humane sort of work during the years, and the gifts of cigarettes, although it is only a little thing, has meant a great deal to our veterans and has very markedly helped their morale. Especially is this little action of service appreciated in mental hospitals where there is a loneliness which is all too pervading and which is mitigated by the visits of groups with their gifts of cigarettes.

As a practical proposition, it will mean that we can now give 2 packs of cigarettes where only 1 was given before.

I want to commend the administration for its sympathetic interest in our veterans and its fine action in their behalf. It is a very happy and also a proper decision. It emphasizes that in its view, also, it should make no difference in determining the question of whether a cigarette ought to be tax free, whether the veteran lies in a Federal bed or in a State bed.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include copies of correspondence between the Internal Revenue Bureau and myself on this subject. The Bureau's letter, especially, will be of very large interest not only to veterans, but to veterans' organizations and other volunteer groups who visit our hospitalized veterans and who have been following the custom of giving gifts of cigarettes.

(The material referred to is as follows:)

UNITED STATES TREASURY DEPARTMENT,
Washington, February 25, 1954.
HON. FRANK J. BECKER,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. BECKER: Representatives of the Internal Revenue Service have just concluded several conferences with representatives of the Veterans' Administration, in a joint effort to work out administratively, in accordance with the request contained in your letter of November 30, 1953, some satisfactory arrangement by which tax-free cigarettes would be made available for gratuitous distribution to present and former members of the military and naval forces of the United States confined in other than Federal hospitals.

These conferences developed the fact that under existing procedures tax-free cigarettes are now distributed free of charge to present or former members of our Armed Forces who are patients in Federal hospitals or in other hospitals where such persons receive medical care pursuant to contract with the Veterans' Administration. Therefore, the efforts of the conferees were confined to the matter or working out an arrangement which would make tax-free cigarettes available for distribution to present or former members of the Armed Forces of our country hospitalized in hospitals operated by the several States and the District of Columbia. I am happy to advise that as a result of the sympathetic understanding of the problem and a mutual desire on the part of the Internal Revenue Service and the Veterans' Administration to cooperate in alleviating the situation of which you complain, agreement has been reached on an administrative arrangement under which tax-free cigarettes could be furnished to such present and former servicemen.

Briefly, this arrangement would provide that the officers in charge of such hospitals will act as representatives of the Veterans Administration in the purchase, storage and distribution of the tax-free cigarettes and that the purchase, storage and distribution of the tax-free cigarettes by such representatives will be accomplished under the necessary supervision and control of the Veterans' Administration. The arrangement also contemplates that any organization of war veterans which is granted recognition (by or pursuant to the provisions of section 200, Public Law 844, 74th Cong., 38 U. S. C. sec. 101) in the presentation of claims under the statutes administered by the Veterans' Administration, or any local post or chapter of any such recognized organization, may donate cigarettes for this purpose by turning over to the head of such a hospital the funds with which to purchase the tax-free cigarettes.

In order to aid in carrying this arrangement into effect, the Internal Revenue Service proposes to amend such of its applicable regulations as may be necessary to permit the sale of tax-free cigarettes for the purpose described above.

Very truly yours,

O. GORDON DELK,
Acting Commissioner.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C. November 30, 1953.
MR. T. COLEMAN ANDREWS,
Commissioner, Bureau of Internal
Revenue, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. ANDREWS: It is good to know that this administration is willing and anxious to give painstaking and cooperative consideration to the setting up of methods, without the need of statutory legislation,

for the distribution of tax-free cigarettes to veterans in other than Federal hospitals.

This matter has had your consideration and also that of the Treasury Department for some time and I hope the studies that have been made, both from the practical and the legal angles, will thoroughly satisfy the Internal Revenue Bureau that a method can be agreed upon which will do the two things we are aiming at: from my viewpoint, to help widen and broaden the efforts of our veterans organizations to enhance the benefits they are accomplishing through the distribution of cigarettes to hospitalized servicemen and former servicemen and, at the same time, from your viewpoint, to set up such safeguards in the distribution of these tax-free cigarettes as will properly protect the integrity of our Internal Revenue system.

On the latter point, specifically, I want to acknowledge your kindness in your letter to me of April 30 to volunteer the comment that you appreciated my interest in safeguarding the revenue by inclusion in legislation I had introduced of provisions specifying particular safeguards under which cigarettes might be bought tax-free for distribution to our veterans.

I have cooperated with veterans organizations in this particular work for many, many years. I am confident, without any reservations, that I reflect their ideas completely when I state that it would be a wonderful, a grand action by this administration to accomplish the distribution of tax-free cigarettes to hospitals, other than Federal, but which also house our former servicemen and veterans. The veterans organizations have been doing an outstanding work, a very human sort of work during the years, and the gratuity of free cigarettes, although it is only a little thing, has helped tremendously in building up desirable morale among our hospitalized veterans. You would see this especially—most sharply—in the mental hospitals, where, entirely too much, there is a loneliness which is all too pervading and which the visits by members of local posts and chapters of our veterans organizations helps much to dispel and mitigate, and when such visits are accompanied by the distribution of cigarettes and other little gratuities.

There is no question of moment involved here touching dollars and cents. Your bureau is already on record as not being at all minded to finally judge this matter from the revenue viewpoint. The agreement that we must reach is how we may best accomplish the desires of the veterans organizations and at the same time meet your policy needs insofar as the protection of the revenue goes.

Here is my suggestion, predicated on this main and fundamental idea: that the serviceman or the former serviceman is to be served. Therefore, it should make no difference whether this veteran lies in a Federal bed or in a State bed, or whether his hospitalization is paid for by the Federal Government or by a State.

It seems to me it is a cruel discrimination which can distinguish between a Federally hospitalized and a State hospitalized veteran, whether the latter is under contract with the Veterans' Administration or not. In the average contract hospital case it seems to me that it would be logical and eminently proper to have the director of such a hospital act for and on behalf of the Veterans' Administration and/or the Internal Revenue Bureau so far as the ordering, receipt, and distribution of tax-free cigarettes is concerned. The test should not be the type of hospital or who runs it; it ought to be the veteran who is in that hospital, and if that veteran served in the Army, Navy, the Air Force, the Marine Corps, or the Coast Guard, or in any branch thereof, that should be enough. The present law permitting tax-free cigarette distribution

to veterans in Federal hospitals I do not believe was intended to be exclusive in character, and that the real objective in that provision was to reach the hospitalized veteran.

Taking Kings Park Hospital on Long Island as an illustration: This is a State institution, a mental hospital. There are veterans hospitalized there on a Veterans' Administration contract basis. There are also State cases there, presumably. A few miles away is the Northport Hospital of the Veterans' Administration. In the latter our veterans organizations can arrange for the distribution as gifts of tax-free cigarettes. At Kings Park they may not. And here is a service that under the present scheme of things is denied the man who happens to be lodged at Kings Park. As I said before, it is a cruel discrimination. It would be an easy thing, as I see it, to make the director of the Kings Park Hospital the agent of the Veterans' Administration for the distribution of tax-free cigarettes to the veterans of that hospital.

I should, of course, be most happy to meet with you at any time or times to help gain a solution of this matter and thus to help very materially and substantially the service by your veterans organizations to those unhappy people, the Nation's veterans, who chance to be hospitalized.

I can only reemphasize that I know every veterans organization and all of our people generally would applaud an administrative decision by this administration along the lines of my submission to the end that the fine and the humanitarian work they are now doing may be broadened and expanded.

Yours respectfully,

FRANK J. BECKER.

REDUCTION OF EXCISE TAXES

Mr. KNOX. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. KNOX. Mr. Speaker, the proposed cut in the excise tax contained in H. R. 8224 on many of the necessities of life will undoubtedly provide one of the best stimulants to business of any proposal to come before this House.

As taxpayers, we are now handing over \$1 billion of our money each year, paying as high as 25 percent in excise taxes just for the privilege of buying everyday necessary articles of clothing or services which we need.

By reducing the excise tax to 10 percent, we are freeing major segments of our economy from a yoke that has in some instances almost throttled businesses to death. Some of the current unemployment undoubtedly can be traced to this source.

The purchasing power of every American family will be increased measurably by this reduction in excise taxes. Business will be stimulated, and in turn provide additional revenue for the Government. Now is the time to remove a major portion of this annoying, discriminatory system of taxation.

DEFENSE AND HUMAN VALUES

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, there is a rather pathetic inconsistency on the part of those who now spread hysteria and terrorism among the American people about the horrible dangers of atomic air attack, yet who just a few months ago were moving so expeditiously to cut down and cripple our air arm to the tune of over \$5 billion.

There has been a great deal of false propaganda, loose thinking, and misconception concerning the atomic and hydrogen bombs. You are familiar with some of the speeches and statements which would in effect spread fear and terror among our people. Such utterances, whether so intended or not, tend in the direction of appeasement and confusion.

Regardless of the admittedly destructive power of these new weapons, our political leadership has essential and greatest responsibility toward the American people. First, to set up appropriate defenses and countermeasures and, secondly, to do and say nothing that would arouse irrational fear and apprehension among the people, thirdly, to draw the shades of secrecy from the basic facts of the atom without disclosing strictly security information.

It is believed by experts that a high percentage of attacking planes could get through. General Vandenberg set the figure some time ago at about 70 percent. However, the extensive radar screens and new techniques we have developed are now believed to warrant a much lower estimate of attacking planes that could get through. Instead of prating about these dangers, it should be the duty of the Congress to do something about them, to implement the right kind of defense as speedily as possible and without regard to the cost.

It would be fatuous and the height of folly for this Nation to reduce or keep down the cost of national defense just to serve the purposes and fatten the tax pocketbooks of members of the "big business" axis and its satellites. Yet that seems to be perhaps the pervading spirit to date—a disregard for human values; the accentuation of greedy, selfish policies to preserve material wealth. Of course, such policies will never secure the long-time approval of the American people; indeed, they forfeit majority support.

I have been in vigorous support of every measure to build a strong defense, particularly a strong Air Force. I believe in a balanced defense, not one that would be weighted against the Army or the Navy because I believe them both to be of paramount importance, but one that will give the Nation a rounded defensive military system and also a most powerful Air Arm that would enable us on a world-wide basis, if necessary, to launch devastating retaliatory attacks upon any nation or group of nations evil enough to challenge our security and the cause of human freedom.

Congress must stand for the kind of dynamic military institutions which the

Nation needs in these troubled, unsettled times.

If we start measuring and limiting our military system by our tax pocketbooks, we should keep it in mind that the time may well come when the national security will be gravely imperiled.

I am continuing my efforts as a member of the House Armed Services Committee to accelerate the program designed to protect the Nation against attack, as well as that necessary to retaliate against attack. Both are of paramount essentiality. Both must be implemented with every possible speed. Both must be shaped in such ways as to retain balanced, well-rounded and where necessary, integrated Armed Forces capable of defending the country and also capable of seeking out and destroying the enemy whenever an attack is made upon our shores or cities.

More than ever we need now to emphasize human values before material values in our national life and in the setting up of necessary defenses.

I do not believe for a moment that any loyal American would intentionally wish at this time to weaken or impair our armed strength and thus make the Nation more vulnerable to attack.

The point I am making is that apparently some people in public life today are willing to curtail military appropriations very materially, notwithstanding the present very dubious prospects of world order. I believe such a course, motivated in large measure by material values and the quest for diminished taxes, is a serious risk, so I believe, to the security of the country.

Let us not only zealously preserve our spiritual ideals which are the very source of our strength, but let us also protect our human values—the well-being of the individual as well as the safety, security, and prosperity of all our people. The national defense must be our constant and most intensive concern. It should not be jeopardized by materialistic and selfish aims.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. RABAUT asked and was given permission to address the House for 10 minutes today, following the other special orders.

FARM PRICE PARITY AND PROSPERITY

The SPEAKER. Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. POAGE] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, a few days ago I called the attention of this House to the fact that the whole prosperity of this Nation was dependent on the prosperity of our farmers; that we could not have a lasting, prosperous economy unless we had a prosperous agriculture; that if we allowed farm prices to sink to 75 percent of parity, or below, that we would inevitably have disastrous depression and unemployment sweeping all sections of the country; whereas, on the other hand, we had never known a period when the average of farm prices

was as high as 100 percent of parity that all of our people were not prosperous.

In view of this fact it seems to me clear that we should maintain as far as we can the price of our basic agricultural commodities at at least 90 percent of parity and not let them drop down to the disastrous level advocated by some which would break not only the farmers but all of our people.

We have been told that we ought to have flexibility in any program. I do not know why. We are told by some highly placed agricultural authorities that we need flexibility in our farm price-support program. The great girders that support our bridges are not supposed to be flexible; the foundations of our homes are not supposed to be flexible. I do not know why supports on agricultural commodities are desired to be flexible. I want these supports to be firm when the weight of our economy falls on them. I don't want them to flex when they should hold firm. We are told we need sliding supports. Why? Do we want price supports to slide out from under the farmer every time he needs them?

I think it would be well to observe that if there is any need for flexibility in a price-support program we have all we need in the present program. We do not have the "high" "rigid" supports that some people have talked about. We have never had a rigid support, one that does not change. The supports on all of our basic agricultural products do change. They change regularly. They are tied to parity. Parity is tied to the cost of the things farmers buy. We are supporting those basic commodities at only 90 percent of parity; that is, only 90 percent of a fair price. When the general economy of our Nation goes up, employment increases, wages go up, farmers' costs go up, and parity goes up. The dollars and cents level of support of those commodities, of course, then increases. On the other hand, when the temper of our economy slows down, when people become unemployed, when wages drop, when prices are lower, then parity drops, and the 90 percent of parity at which we support farm prices is in dollars a lesser figure than it would be if conditions were better. So we have today in our present program the only type of flexibility that I want or that I believe the American people need.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POAGE. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. The gentleman is making a very scholarly address. I have followed the gentleman's record in the Congress since he first became a Member. He has always been sincere and devoted to the cause of agriculture of the United States. In reaching the point you have in your address, do you not feel that we do have a flexible support as now set up for the basic commodities, such as cotton? While it is a support of 90 percent of parity, it is flexible?

Mr. POAGE. It is, indeed. Every time the price level goes up that support goes up in dollars, but when the price level goes down and the farmer

can buy at a lower level, his support also goes down in dollars.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Like, for instance, the price of automobiles, of General Motors, Chrysler or any automobile company. The price may go up and it may come down.

Mr. POAGE. That is right.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. So, likewise, the support at 90 percent on the basic commodities is also flexible?

Mr. POAGE. That is right. It is flexible now and it is tied to the general economy of the Nation, it is tied to the prices that the farmer has to pay; but there are those who are telling us that these supports should not be tied to what the farmer has to pay, on the contrary they want supports tied to the amount of commodities produced, to make the whole support program ineffective when it is needed, and leave it at an effective level only when it is not needed. To me the proposal of a sliding scale simply means slide out from under you every time we need any support.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POAGE. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. ARENDS. Will the gentleman tell the House what he proposes in the way of a farm program? As the gentleman knows, we have to do something about it.

Mr. POAGE. Yes.

Mr. ARENDS. Has the gentleman some ready recommendation besides 90 percent support prices to meet the situation?

Mr. POAGE. First, I do recommend a continuation of 90 percent of parity supports on storable basic commodities. Of course, the 90 percent support price alone is inadequate. I think the gentleman will agree with that. You have to have a good many things to go with that support price. We need especially disposal programs. As I have visualized it for a good many years, there are at least two outstanding prerequisites which must exist before the farmers can properly call upon the Government to give them the 90 percent support now available to storable basics. First, the product that they ask to be supported must of necessity be storable, else there is no opportunity for the Government to carry it over from year to year in order to work out the problem without undue loss.

In the second place, it seems to me that the farmers themselves must be willing to carry a portion of the burden. We have recognized that in the case of the six basic commodities by providing that at any time the farmers themselves refuse to approve marketing quotas and acreage allotments, that the support shall only be 50 percent of parity instead of 90 percent of parity; in other words, we say that "over the long pull, Mr. Farmer, you must, working together, bring your production in line with the demand, else the Government will not help you over the short pull to make the adjustment."

Now, it is much more difficult for farmers to make adjustments than it is for a manufacturing plant. It takes a longer period of time because it takes

a cycle of at least 12 months to carry out a farm operation, and consequently you cannot make the changes so rapidly. That is why it seems to me eminently sound that the Government should help tide farmers over during that period of change, and that is all we ask. That is exactly what happens on the support of these basic commodities, the storables. In the days of old Joseph, away back in Pharaoh's time in Egypt, they took their products during the period of flush production and put them in the granaries and held them there until the time when need came. The Government can do that with these commodities today.

Now there are those who say that will not work. But it has worked. Our great crop in my section of the country is cotton, and we can carry cotton for many, many years after it is picked and stored, and the United States Government, through the cooperation of our farmers who have repeatedly voted to limit their production and who have never rejected controls, has right now a net profit of \$267 million through the process of supporting the cotton crop. Not only did we aid the cotton farmers of America, but we put \$267 million into the Public Treasury. Now that is not a bad deal for the United States Government.

There are other crops where we do not have the storability that we have in those six major crops, particularly the dairy commodities and fresh meats, and I recognize you cannot apply to those perishable commodities the same kind of treatment that you can apply to the basic storable commodities, both because you cannot store them and because you cannot control the production of them like you can control the production of these basic commodities.

Unquestionably the producers of those commodities are entitled to every consideration we can consistently give them.

So it would seem to me that we must emphasize the disposition, the sale, of larger quantities of those commodities, and while I have been reluctant to follow the philosophy of subsidy, I listened this morning to the distinguished Assistant Secretary of Agriculture, our former colleague, Hon. Ross Rizley, who came before the Committee on Agriculture and pleaded for a subsidy on wool. And, I do not know that there is any better way of handling it. I do not know that we can offer anything better than what has been suggested, and that is to pay a subsidy on wool. Maybe we must rely on subsidies and on purchase programs for these perishable commodities. Maybe we must use indirect supports.

Mr. ARENDS. We face a little different situation with corn than you do with cotton. As I understand, when the acreage reduction in both cotton and wheat first came in here and we increased the acreage reduction, you did not want to abide by the acreage reduction, and you increased it on cotton and wheat. In the commercial corn area, particularly in my section of Illinois, they reduced the corn acreage from 20.8 to 27 percent, and the normal farmer who has been trying to conserve his soil finds himself in a predicament. Now that we are trying to solve the problem,

what are we going to do with the corn allotment?

Mr. POAGE. The gentleman from Illinois is very much better versed on corn than I am, but I would be inclined to go along with him if he feels that this 27-percent reduction is too much to take in 1 year. I would be inclined to agree with him and go along with whatever figure he felt was a reasonable proposal, just as he went along with us on the cotton proposition when we felt that 33 1/3 percent was too great and cut the reduction down to about 22 percent, because we felt 33 1/3 percent was more than the cotton farmer should take in 1 year. We suggested that it would be better to spread it over 2 years instead of 1. I do not know whether the amount that is being proposed now for corn is too great. If it is too great, I recognize that you can store corn, and you can carry it for a period of several years, and that it is not essential that you take all the necessary cut in 1 year. I think that is one of the beauties of the Government's giving assistance in these programs. The Government can carry these commodities over a longer period of time than any one individual farmer can carry them. That should enable us to make the needed cut by such degrees as will enable us to step down, as I tried to suggest once, in 2 steps rather than 1, and maybe not break a leg in doing it.

It is quite possible that the gentleman from Illinois may want to suggest that we take the reduction in corn acreage in more than one step. Ultimately we will have to come down just as much in both cotton and corn. I think we must recognize that. We have no illusions as to cotton. We know we are ultimately going to have to come down. We started to come all the way in 1 step, but we are now proposing to do it in 2. But we do believe that the farmers must express their good faith by being willing to bring production down to the level that the people will consume, because if we keep producing more than the people will consume we certainly cannot expect the Government forever to take it off our hands. But I do think we should take the cut in such steps as will not destroy the patient as we do it.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. POAGE asked and was given permission to address the House for 30 minutes on Tuesday next, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered.

FOREIGN TRADE POLICY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. STAGGERS] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker, how many American citizens must be out of work before this administration will do anything to relieve unemployment? How long must our people be out of work before this administration will take action? From past experience, it appears that neither question is of any concern when a greedy administration comes into

power, yet it is inconceivable that anyone with a scintilla of respect for his fellow human beings would endorse or even passively accept the conditions responsible for their distress—regardless of political considerations involved.

Whereas Members of Congress have been reminded time and again of the need to protect the domestic coal industry and other American industries from the ravages of cheap foreign products unloaded in this country, it is probable that top administration officials have not been properly advised of the damage that is being inflicted by excessive imports. Otherwise those officials could hardly recommend a continuance of the policies responsible for the unemployment and poverty that have become prevalent in my district and in many other districts of this once-prosperous Nation.

Last July 23 the House had an opportunity to correct unfair foreign trade policies through passage of a bill to place a quota limitation on residual oil and to make other necessary changes in the Nation's trade program. But at the last minute the majority leader rushed up Pennsylvania Avenue with word that the bill should not be passed. Unlike Paul Revere, who warned his countrymen of an impending invasion by foreign forces, this messenger was armed with orders to continue the policies of confining American business within an economic stockade in order that international interests might continue to profit without restriction. The excuse for this directive was that a commission to study the trade problem had been established, and that it appeared more politic to force Americans to endure their suffering rather than to disturb the marketing tactics of international profiteers. "I do not intend any criticism at all of those who have spoken here today, who have industries in their districts that are under severe hardships," the majority leader, the gentleman from Indiana, said to the House on that fateful day last year. Then he proceeded to issue the mandate for rejection of the bill to safeguard American industry and labor. Here is the way he explained the administration's anomalous position to his colleagues:

He—

The President—

wants this bill defeated, because it defeats the purposes, it defeats what we are trying to do in this other operation.

So I say that we ought to stand by the administration; not just because it is a matter of standing by the administration, but because it is the proper thing to do.

Mr. Speaker, it is now a full 7 months later, the commission studying foreign trade has made its report, and the administration is still standing by despite the fact that economic conditions in my district and in scores of other districts in the United States are getting progressively worse. Foreign residual oil is causing more and more unemployment in the coal and railroad industries, and the distress has spread to countless other businesses. In the glass industry there has been a steady decline as a result of the influx of foreign products made by

laborers whose wages would be entirely unacceptable in this country.

The disastrous effects of the deluge of residual oil on the economy of this country were described in full last year by such prominent industry and labor representatives as Tom Pickett, former Member of Congress and now executive vice president of the National Coal Association; Thomas Kennedy, former Lieutenant Governor of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania and the vice president of United Mine Workers of America; Harry See, national legislative representative, Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen; and W. D. Johnson, vice president and national legislative representative, Order of Railway Conductors.

As for the impact of foreign products on the handmade-glass industry of this country, let me point out that the Morgantown Chamber of Commerce last month submitted a statement to the United States Tariff Commission showing that the industry in our area has been badly hurt in the past several years and that there is an imminent prospect of further layoffs. Our workers are highly skilled artisans who have spent many years learning their trade, and many of them are third-generation glassworkers who know no other trade.

In view of this testimony, is the administration willing to continue the prevailing trade policies, or can we finally expect action that will enable our industries to prosper once more and restore to our citizens the rights to those jobs from which they have been disfranchised by cheap foreign labor?

As Representative of a district that has been unjustifiably imposed upon by insane foreign-trade practices, I implore you to give ear to the prayers of our own people regardless of whether the remedy conflicts with the contents of any messages that may be carried up Pennsylvania Avenue in behalf of a political philosophy.

EXCISE TAXES ON AUTOMOTIVE PRODUCTS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. RABAUT] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, yesterday's action by the House Ways and Means Committee on excise taxes is, to say the very least, disappointing to me and to the millions of people in America who are vitally concerned with the welfare of the automobile industry.

In his announcement when he introduced the bill, the chairman of the committee, the gentleman from New York [Mr. REE], said the excise tax cuts provided by the bill would "give needed stimulation immediately to consumer purchasing power." It would, he said, "give immediate stimulation to the Nation's business."

In all sincerity, let us take a look at the facts of the present economic situation. Is there any segment of American business more in need of stimulation than the automotive industry? This

House is aware, I am sure, that many thousands of workers in Detroit and other automotive production centers have been laid off because new car inventories are rapidly piling up and because a number of other factors point to declines in automobile sales this year.

This industry right now needs the shot in the arm that a reduction in excise tax rates can give it. Instead of a shot in the arm it has been given a stab in the back by this excise tax bill, because, in addition to denying the industry any relief, the bill establishes as permanent law 10-percent excise taxes on passenger cars, 8-percent taxes on trucks, buses and automotive parts. There is no expiration date in the bill for these excises, an action which is without precedent in my memory as to excise-tax legislation. This bill means the permanent saddling of this great industry with a crippling tax burden.

Henry Ford everlastingly proved that if you can get the price of automobiles low enough you can sell them and sell them in such quantities that the automobile industry will rank as the foremost manufacturing enterprise in the Nation. Because he mass-produced low-priced automobiles the industry has passed far beyond the luxury class. It now turns out a product that is a vital necessity in our way of life—a necessity in more ways than I have time to recite. The job of 1 out of every 7 workers in America today is in some way related to the automobile. The automobile has necessitated our good roads—it was the progenitor of the petroleum industry—it provides a means of intercourse and communication between our peoples that is convenient and inexpensive. I could go on, but I would only be belaboring the obvious. The importance of the automobile is the common knowledge of everyone.

Why then the discrimination in this bill against the automobile industry—an industry that draws raw materials and manufactured products from every part of the Nation? Ladies' handbags, fancy furs, costume jewelry, shaving lotion and eau de cologne, movie tickets, flash bulbs, and fountain pens are getting preferential treatment at the expense of an industry that is a vital part of our national economy. I am not arguing against relief for these other products. On the merits of each case, they may all be entitled to relief. But I cannot see the justice or the logic of such relief when the automobile industry is made to carry the burden of avoiding further budget deficits.

During the last great war, the executives of the automobile industry and the highly skilled, energetic and productive workers who manned the automobile factories earned for Detroit the title of the "Hub of the Arsenal of Democracy."

Does it seem just, by any stretch of the imagination, that, after this splendid record in time of war and of service to the peacetime economy of the Nation, the automobile industry should be per-

manently burdened with the load of these taxes?

What pains me most is the absence of a termination date in this bill. It would appear that the committee has decided, as a matter of policy, that excise taxes shall be a permanent source of revenue and that the automobile industry, because of the great volume of its business, will have to carry the load in avoiding budget deficits.

This legislation is grossly unjust. It is discriminatory. It is economically unsound. I hope the injustice of the provision will impress itself upon the House.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. MCGREGOR and to include certain charts, the result of a questionnaire recently sent out by him.

Mr. KELLEY of Pennsylvania.

Mr. HOLTZMAN in two instances.

Mr. DIES and to include a speech on outlawing the Communist conspiracy.

Mr. WOLVERTON.

Mr. BUSBEY the remarks he will make in the Committee of the Whole today and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. ROONEY the remarks he will make in the Committee of the Whole today and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania on a bill he is introducing today.

Mr. ROBINO (at the request of Mr. FRIEDEL).

Mr. WESTLAND.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. SEELY-BROWN (at the request of Mr. SADLAK) for March 5, on account of illness in the family.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. LECOMPTE, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 2984. An act to prohibit reduction of any rating of total disability or permanent total disability for compensation, pension, or insurance purposes which has been in effect for 20 or more years; and

H. R. 7996. An act making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1954, and for other purposes.

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. LECOMPTE, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on this day present to the President, for his approval, bills of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 687. An act for the relief of Sister Walfrida (Anna Nelles) and Sister Amaltrudis (Gertrude Schneider);

H. R. 711. An act for the relief of Mrs. Ruth R. Ekholm;
 H. R. 749. An act for the relief of Shul-Pook Fung;
 H. R. 788. An act for the relief of Beryl Williams;
 H. R. 823. An act for the relief of Abraham G. Sakin;
 H. R. 824. An act for the relief of Demetrios Konstantino Papanicolaou;
 H. R. 828. An act for the relief of Dr. Vincenzo Guzzo;
 H. R. 907. An act for the relief of Wolodymyr Hirniak;
 H. R. 946. An act for the relief of Mrs. Louise Blackstone;
 H. R. 965. An act for the relief of Michael Demcheshen;
 H. R. 1339. An act for the relief of Dr. Soon Tai Ryang;
 H. R. 1346. An act for the relief of Zia Edin Taheri and Frances Hakimzadeh Taheri;
 H. R. 1358. An act for the relief of Dr. Marcelino J. Avelilla and Dr. Teodora A. Fide-lino-Avelilla;
 H. R. 1495. An act for the relief of Louis M. Jacobs;
 H. R. 1649. An act for the relief of Mrs. Gisela Walter Sizemore;
 H. R. 1688. An act for the relief of Henry Ty;
 H. R. 1795. An act for the relief of Helena Shostenko;
 H. R. 2035. An act for the relief of Mrs. Michalline Borzecka;
 H. R. 2387. An act for the relief of William M. Smith;
 H. R. 2504. An act for the relief of Sisters Adelaide Canelas and Maria Isabel Franco;
 H. R. 2507. An act for the relief of Alfonso Gatti;
 H. R. 2622. An act for the relief of Maria Teresa Ortega Perez;
 H. R. 2623. An act for the relief of Jose M. Thomasa-Sanchez, Adela Duran Cuevas de Thomasa, and Jose Maria Thomasa Duran;
 H. R. 2774. An act for the relief of Endre Szende, Zsuzsanna Szende, Katalin Szende (a minor), and Maria Szende (a minor);
 H. R. 2817. An act for the relief of George A. Ferris;
 H. R. 3005. An act for the relief of Charles Sabah;
 H. R. 3236. An act for the relief of Constantin and Lucia (Bercescu) Turcano;
 H. R. 3455. An act for the relief of Jalal Rashtan;
 H. R. 3749. An act for the relief of Wolde-mar Jaskowsky; and
 H. R. 5773. An act to provide for the refund, under certain conditions, of money paid as premiums on United States Government life insurance or national service life insurance which is canceled for fraud.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 4 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, March 5, 1953, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1328. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting proposed amendments to the budget for the fiscal year 1953 involving a decrease in the amount of \$23,900,000 for the Atomic Energy Commission (H. Doc. No. 348); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

1329. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a draft of a bill entitled "A bill to amend the Universal Military Training and Service Act, as amended, to remove the requirement for a final physical examination for inductees who continue on active duty in another status in the Armed Forces"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1330. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting the annual report for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, of the exchange stabilization fund created by section 10 (b) of the Gold Reserve Act of 1934, approved January 30, 1934, as amended, pursuant to section 10 (a) of the act; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

1331. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting the report of the Bureau of Mines for the calendar year January 1, 1953, through December 31, 1953, pursuant to sections 102 (a) and 212 (c) of the Federal Coal Mine Safety Act (66 Stat. 692; Public Law 552, 82d Cong.); to the Committee on Education and Labor.

1332. A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a draft of a bill entitled "A bill to amend the act entitled 'An act authorizing the Director of the Census to collect and publish statistics of cotton'"; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

1333. A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a draft of a bill entitled "A bill to amend the act of June 19, 1948, to provide for censuses of manufactures, mineral industries, and other businesses," relating to the year 1954; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. COLE of Missouri: Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. H. R. 573. A bill prohibiting lithographing or engraving on envelopes sold by the Post Office Department, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 1303). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BURDICK: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 2098. A bill to provide for the compensation of certain persons whose lands have been flooded and damaged by reason of fluctuations in the water level of the Lake of the Woods; with amendment (Rept. No. 1304). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H. R. 7057. A bill to authorize the Secretaries of Agriculture and Interior to transfer, exchange, and dispose of land in the Eden project, Wyoming, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1305). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. GRAHAM: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 8092. A bill to facilitate the entry of Philippine traders; without amendment (Rept. No. 1306). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. REED of New York: Committee on Ways and Means. H. R. 8224. A bill to reduce excise taxes, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1307). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. DONDERO: Committee on Public Works. H. R. 8127. A bill to amend and supplement the Federal-Aid Road Act approved July 11, 1916 (39 Stat. 355), as amended and supplemented, to authorize appro-

priations for continuing the construction of highways, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1308). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. GRAHAM: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 54. An act for the relief of Juan Ezcurra and Francisco Ezcurra; without amendment (Rept. No. 1269). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. GRAHAM: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 316. An act for the relief of Vera Lazaros and Cristo Lazaros; without amendment (Rept. No. 1270). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. GRAHAM: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 551. An act for the relief of Mamertas Cvirka and Mrs. Petronele Cvirka; without amendment (Rept. No. 1271). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. GRAHAM: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 850. An act for the relief of Alice Power and Ruby Power; without amendment (Rept. No. 1272). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. GRAHAM: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 931. An act for the relief of Vilhjalmur Thorlaksson Bjarnar; without amendment (Rept. No. 1273). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. GRAHAM: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 1038. An act for the relief of Silva Galjevsek; without amendment (Rept. No. 1274). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. GRAHAM: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 1137. An act for the relief of Utako Kanitz; without amendment (Rept. No. 1275). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. GRAHAM: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 1440. An act for the relief of Paolo Danesi; without amendment (Rept. No. 1276). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. GRAHAM: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 1652. An act for the relief of Robert A. Tyrrell; without amendment (Rept. No. 1277). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. GRAHAM: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 2073. An act for the relief of Esther Wagner; without amendment (Rept. No. 1278). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. GRAHAM: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 683. A bill for the relief of George P. Symnriotis; with amendment (Rept. No. 1279). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 970. A bill for the relief of George Economos; with amendment (Rept. No. 1280). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Miss THOMPSON of Michigan: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1755. A bill for the relief of Theresa Mire Piantoni; with amendment (Rept. No. 1281). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1784. A bill for the relief of Rito Solla; with amendment (Rept. No. 1282). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. HYDE: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 2385. A bill for the relief of Giuseppe Fruscone; without amendment (Rept. No. 1283). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 2404. A bill to adjust the status of a displaced person in the United States who does not meet all the requirements of section 4 of the Displaced Persons Act; with amendment (Rept. No. 1284). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 2406. A bill to adjust the status of a displaced person in the United States who does not meet all the requirements of section 4 of the Displaced Persons Act; with amendment (Rept. No. 1285). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. GRAHAM: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 3349. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Margarete Burdo; without amendment (Rept. No. 1286). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Miss THOMPSON of Michigan: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 3876. A bill for the relief of Martha Schnauffer; with amendment (Rept. No. 1287). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 4135. A bill for the relief of George Telegdy and Julia Peyer Telegdy; without amendment (Rept. No. 1288). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 4864. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Hildegard Noel; without amendment (Rept. No. 1289). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Miss THOMPSON of Michigan: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 5090. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Magdalene Zarnovski Austin; with amendment (Rept. No. 1290). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. JONAS of Illinois: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 214. An act for the relief of Geraldine B. Mathews; with amendment (Rept. No. 1291). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. RODINO: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 2791. A bill for the relief of Esther E. Ellicott; with amendment (Rept. No. 1292). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. MILLER of New York: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 3109. A bill for the relief of Theodore W. Carlson; without amendment (Rept. No. 1293). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. RODINO: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 3672. A bill for the relief of Clyde M. Litton; with amendment (Rept. No. 1294). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. RODINO: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 3751. A bill for the relief of Alexandria S. Balasko; with amendment (Rept. No. 1295). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BURDICK: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 3756. A bill for the relief of Allen Pope, his heirs or personal representatives; with amendment (Rept. No. 1296). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. RODINO: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 3970. A bill for the relief of Bernhard F. Elmers; without amendment (Rept. No. 1297). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. RODINO: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 4475. A bill for the relief of Curtis W. McPhail; with amendment (Rept. No. 1298). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. RODINO: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 4713. A bill for the relief of Paul E. Milward; with amendment (Rept. No. 1299). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. MILLER of New York: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 5436. A bill for the relief of David Hanan; with amendment

(Rept. No. 1300). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 5460. A bill for the relief of Sgt. Chancy C. Newsom; with amendment (Rept. No. 1301). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 4532. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Ann Elizabeth Caulk; with amendment (Rept. No. 1302). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. McCULLOCH:

H. R. 8220. A bill to revise, codify, and enact into law, title 20 of the United States Code, entitled "Education"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 8221. A bill to revise, codify, and enact into law, title 21 of the United States Code, entitled "Food and Drugs"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MEADER:

H. R. 8222. A bill to amend various statutes and certain titles of the United States Code, for the purpose of correcting obsolete references, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McCULLOCH:

H. R. 8223. A bill to revise, codify, and enact into law, title 23 of the United States Code, entitled "Highways"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. REED of New York:

H. R. 8224. A bill to reduce excise taxes, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BAKER:

H. R. 8225. A bill to establish public use of the national forests as a policy of Congress, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. COOLEY:

H. R. 8226. A bill to encourage the improvement and development of marketing facilities for handling perishable agricultural commodities; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. ELLIOTT:

H. R. 8227. A bill to amend the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act in order to provide that revenues under the provisions of such act shall be used as grants-in-aid of primary, secondary, and higher education; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 8228. A bill to provide adequate diets for the unemployed and their families in distress areas of unemployment; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H. R. 8229. A bill to amend the hospital survey and construction provisions of the Public Health Service Act to provide assistance to the States for surveying the need for diagnostic or treatment centers, for hospitals for the chronically ill and impaired, for rehabilitation facilities, and for nursing homes, and to provide assistance in the construction of such facilities through grants to public and nonprofit agencies, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. McVEY:

H. R. 8230. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code to permit a taxpayer to deduct tuition expenses paid by him for the education of his children through the 12th grade; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MILLER of Maryland:

H. R. 8231. A bill to amend the Agricultural Act of 1949 to provide a limitation on the downward adjustment of price supports for milk and butterfat and the prod-

ucts of milk and butterfat; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H. R. 8232. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Commerce, acting through the Coast and Geodetic Survey, to assist the States of Maryland and Delaware to reestablish their common boundary; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. POAGE:

H. R. 8233. A bill to promote the agriculture of the United States by acquiring and diffusing useful information regarding agriculture in foreign countries and the marketing of American agricultural commodities, and the products thereof, outside of the United States; to authorize the creation of an Agricultural Foreign Service in the Department of Agriculture; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. SCOTT:

H. R. 8234. A bill to incorporate the American Federation of the Physically Handicapped; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. VELDE:

H. R. 8235. A bill to appropriate money for the construction of the Calumet-Sag Channel, Ill., and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. WESTLAND:

H. R. 8236. A bill to amend the Agricultural Act of 1949 so as to provide that feed grains acquired through price-support operations shall be sold to dairy farmers at prices equivalent to 75 percent of parity; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. JENKINS:

H. R. 8237. A bill to limit the term "waterproof" when applied to cloth or fabric; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. YATES:

H. R. 8238. A bill to amend part II of the Interstate Commerce Act to permit individual motor carriers to file suits to enjoin operations being conducted in violation of such part; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Mr. REED of New York:

H. Con. Res. 204. Concurrent resolution providing for the printing of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 and the report thereon; to the Committee on House Administration.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. CHENOWETH:

H. R. 8239. A bill for the relief of Fung Ping Wah (also known as Reginald Ping Wah Fung) and his wife, Fung Wai-Yin Li (also known as Doris Fung); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOLT (by request):

H. R. 8240. A bill for the relief of Fa Hsiang Wu and George Kuosung Wu; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOLTZMAN (by request):

H. R. 8241. A bill for the relief of Letterio (Leo) G. Curro; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 8242. A bill for the relief of Max Moskowitz; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. KELLY of New York:

H. R. 8243. A bill for the relief of Ida Kaganowicz; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KING of California:

H. R. 8244. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Dorothy Nell Woolgar Allen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 8245. A bill for the relief of Juan Ysais-Martinez; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. POWELL:

H. R. 8246. A bill for the relief of Concepcion Gallofin; to the Committee on the Judiciary.